Introduction

Global Internet Governance:

an Unchartered Diplomacy Terrain?[1]

Meryem Marzouki

CNRS & Sorbonne Université

Meryem.Marzouki@lip6.fr

Andrea Calderaro

Cardiff University

CalderaroA@Cardiff.ac.uk

On Friday 27 January, 2017, then Danish Foreign Minister Anders Samuelsen announced his plan for Denmark to become the first nation ever to appoint a 'digital ambassador' (Jarlner and Koch 2017). Noting that giant US digital companies – such as the so-called GAFA (Google, Apple, Facebook and Amazon) – "affect Denmark just as much as entire countries", he concluded that "these companies have become a type of new nations and [Denmark] need[s] to confront that". With the cautious mention that "[Denmark] will, of course, maintain [its] old way of thinking in which [it] foster[s] [its] relationships with other countries. But [Denmark] simply need[s] to have closer ties to some of the companies that affect [it]", the Minister claimed: "We are sending a signal that includes that royal crown and our entire diplomacy" (Jarlner and Koch 2017).

This announcement was, at the same time, a pioneering move and an emblematic sign of the increased centrality of diplomacy to ease tensions around the transnational governance of

---

[1] Calderaro A. & Marzouki, M. (In press/Forthcoming 2022). *Global Internet Governance: an Unchartered Diplomacy Terrain*, in Calderaro A. & Marzouki, M. (Eds.) (in press). "*Internet Diplomacy: shaping the global politics of cyberspace",* Rowman & Littlefield;

digital challenges in foreign relations. However, given the peculiarity of the digital domain, characterized by the transnational nature of its infrastructure, the variety of actors beyond those of the state necessary to negotiate the technical, policy, economic and security aspects of the internet (DeNardis 2018[2]), the translation of this new dimension of diplomacy into a tangible concept and practice is still limited and vague.

Digital issues generate new spaces of conflicts as such, where new diplomatic practices take space to facilitate the negotiations among parties about the governance, policy developments and technical solutions of the internet (Calderaro and Kavada 2011; Radu 2019). As a result of this, in order to understand the shift of diplomatic practices engaging with the digital domain, we need to expand our understanding of the global governance of the internet and identify the tools, venues and processes, so as to adequately address this new dimension of diplomacy (Broeders and van den Berg 2020b).

While Digital Diplomacy is traditionally referred to as the use of digital technologies to engage in diplomatic dialogues (Djola and Zaiotti, 2021), the adoption of diplomatic practices to negotiate the variety of challenges related to the functioning of the digital domain is often framed as Cyber Diplomacy (Riordan 2019) which is defined as "the use of diplomatic resources and the performance of diplomatic functions to secure national interests with regards to the cyberspace" (Barrinha and Renard 2017, 3). Given the focus on the role played by diplomats in ensuring the security of 'national interest", this definition mostly addresses practices performed by traditional diplomats representing the interest of state actors (Thomson 1995). However, it is crucial to take into account that state actors are only partially responsible for the functioning of the internet. If state actors do have the responsibility to provide the legal and policy framework facilitating citizen's online experience, industry traditionally leads the development of the internet infrastructure and most of its services (Powers and Jablonski 2015; Carr 2016). We argue that the concept of

---

[2] As it is impossible to cite here all the relevant work in the internet governance field, this reference is provided as an anthology of such work by a number of authors covering almost all aspects of the global internet governance studies.

diplomacy in the global governance of the internet goes beyond traditional diplomatic practices solely performed by states' representatives. The stability, safety and economy of the internet involve a variety of actors and expertise beyond state actors in the negotiations of technical protocols, international agreements, legislations, and forms of governance accountability in a new dimension of diplomacy (Calderaro 2021), that, with this book, we address as Internet Diplomacy.

Our approach to Internet Diplomacy extends to foreign affairs and international relations, and with regard to all emerging international tensions clustered around digital environments, including cybersecurity, internet governance, and the political economy of the internet. In other words, we refer to Internet Diplomacy as the adoption of diplomatic practices by both state and non-state actors, to negotiate any technical, legal, policy, economy, security issues and practices related to the functioning of the internet.

The Multistakeholderism of Internet Diplomacy

Given the increasing centrality of the governance of the digital field in global politics, we are witnessing a growing need to better understand recent transformations of international diplomacy in this context, their drivers and their nature, whether and how they might change European and transnational power relations and, ultimately, which values they carry and channel on the global scene. Since the UN World Summit on Information Society (WSIS[3]) in 2003/05, the United Nations has established that internet governance processes should be institutionalized in an open and inclusive manner through multistakeholder participation. This decision has extended the invitation at the table of diplomatic negotiations to actors beyond governments, including the business sector and civil society.

---

[3] See UN WSIS related information on ITU website available at: https://www.itu.int/net/wsis/

Since then, multistakeholder participation along this line has characterized several initiatives by the UN and its agencies in the internet governance field, as well as many thematic or regional international organizations (Levinson and Marzouki 2015). As part of recent moves, in July 2018, the United Nations Secretary-General appointed "a High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation", co-chaired by Melinda Gates, Co-Chair of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and Jack Ma, then Executive Chairman of Alibaba Group (UN 2018). In December 2018, the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) adopted a multistakeholder approach by launching the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) to complement the process led by the Group of Governmental Experts (UN GGE[4]) on "advancing responsible State behaviour in cyberspace in the context of international security". While the UN GGE only included diplomats representing 25 selected UN Member States, the UN OEWG[5] in the "field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security" welcomed all UN Member States and representatives of civil society and the business sector to "act on a consensus basis" to contribute to "further develop the rules, norms and principles of responsible behavior of States listed [in the same Resolution], and the ways for their implementation" (UNGA 2018). These UN initiatives and their outcomes offer additional evidence on how the adoption of a multistakeholder approach adopted for the negotiation of internet related issues has set the standards for past, present, and future development of Internet Diplomacy. All this has an impact on the broader field of Global Governance studies and has set important mutations in diplomatic practices beyond the cyber dimension (Scholte 2005).

Given also the variety of actors and experts engaged in the transnational governance of the digital domain, the definition of commonly shared solutions among stakeholders is particularly challenged by the fast-moving target of the negotiations. In particular, the capacity of stakeholders to make informed choices and agree on issues that go beyond the engineering dimension of the internet is challenged by the rapid developments of the technical, social and market aspects of the

[4] See UN GGE webpage at: https://www.un.org/disarmament/group-of-governmental-experts/.
[5] See UN OEWG webpage at: https://www.un.org/disarmament/open-ended-working-group/.

internet. In other words, traditionally, technology evolves quicker than the capacity of policy makers to understand the implications of the technological shift, which is a major obstacle for diplomats and their role in negotiations taking place around digital policy making. As a result of this, technological developments regularly challenge national, regional and global policy making, in terms of sovereignty and other political, legal, economic, social, cultural and societal choices. The mutation of diplomatic practices in Internet Diplomacy reflects these challenges.

At the Crossroads of Globalization and Digitalization

Diplomacy in the transnational governance of the digital domain is called upon to tackle the deep and multifold mutation resulting from multifaceted digital disruptions that affect every aspect of current social, economic and political life. Together with opportunities, these transformations generate challenges in terms of sovereignty, economic development, social cohesion, political and cultural values, legal and policy frameworks (DeNardis 2018). The cross-field nature of the impact of the internet imposes diplomats to adopt a multidisciplinary understanding of the issues, by combining their representative role with scientific advice. Contrary to other fields of global governance clustered around the role of states and international organizations (Zürn 2018), in global internet governance scientific and technical expertise join forces with political influence and diplomatic action to address digital challenges (Kaltofen and Acuto 2018), channel democratic values and share knowledge to build common visions (Scholte 2005).

Moreover, given the transnational nature of the internet, the implementation of digital policies at the national level might generate impacts on a global scale, with potential amplified consequences on global politics. For this reason, we are witnessing an increasing need to enhance international cooperation beyond national borders and national legislations in order to define a

consistent and inclusive transnational governance approach to the cyber domain (Calderaro and Craig 2020).

By global internet governance, we intend not only the restricted issue of managing internet technical resources (infrastructure, protocols and domain names) and technical standards setting (Harcourt, Christou and Simpson 2020), but, as defined by the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG 2005) and adopted in 2005 by the United Nations at WSIS, an extensive set of issues ranging from the "administration of the root zone files and system" to "capacity building" and the "meaningful participation in global policy development" as well as a whole set of human rights and consumer rights issues directly at stake in the governance of information and communication processes (Brousseau and Marzouki 2012).

Among the cross-cutting challenges that domestic and foreign policies are facing, we can identify the following (DeNardis 2018): The difficulty to keep pace with numerous internet innovations in order to make informed choices and decisions on issues that may appear only technical; the difficulty to understand and conciliate roles and positions of a great variety of actors and stakeholders; to identify the different exchanges and dialogues in regional and international fora and to navigate in these waters; and to be aware of their evolving strategies of transaction and coalition, while internet governance has proven to be much more than a public policy issue in light of the essential characteristics of this network (the interconnection is global; its management is distributed) and as it has historically been privately coordinated and operated; There is a need to channel and maintain democratic values in global internet governance processes, namely that of sustainability, participatory governance, openness and transparency in policies and markets, human rights, social justice and social cohesion, as well as democracy and the rule of law. As recent discussions on European digital sovereignty are showing (Christakis 2020; Madiega 2020), this challenge is particularly difficult to address with private US firms, such as the GAFA and other internet giants, including the emerging role played by Chinese ones, dominating the innovation market.

This book stems from the observation of a number of mutations at the crossroads of globalization and digitization. These mutations concern both the global governance of the online world, which has been facing several disruptions, and diplomacy itself, which has been experiencing important transformations. In our view, both categories of mutations must be addressed at the same time, analyzing and understanding the digital disruptive trends they create while exploring how Internet Diplomacy could be an effective mean to address such disruptive trends to keep channeling democratic values in global internet governance processes. Focusing on global internet governance allows exploring, in a consistent way, almost all issues related to globalization and, therefore, at the heart of foreign policy international relations discussions: sovereignty, security, trade, finance and taxation, economic and social transformations (including labor) as well as human rights, democracy and the rule of law. These particularly wide implications of global internet governance result, obviously, from the fact that the internet has become an integral part of the political, economic and social life in all their dimensions and from the fact that the network raises, by construction, cross-border issues.

Understanding Multifaceted Digital Disruptions

Since the internet reached a wide public in the mid-90s, technical, business, marketing, communication and usages innovations have profoundly transformed power relations, in social, economic, normative, institutional and geopolitical terms. Earlier controversies regarding human rights implications of internet use emerged at the national level, leading policy makers to address issues related to conflicts of rights and conflicts of jurisdictions[6]. Becoming even more prominent with the development of social media platforms and their centrality in society's online experience,

---

[6] Such as, for instance: illegal and harmful content vs. freedom of expression; state surveillance, private companies abuses, and various forms of cybercrime activities vs. the protection of privacy and personal data; intellectual property rights vs. a vision of internet content as commons to foster education, knowledge, innovation and global development.

these debates also led to procedural issues related to the role and liability of internet intermediaries and algorithms, in terms of legal, technical and economic aspects.

Ten years later, the United Nations held the WSIS with the ambition to define a globally recognized governance model for the internet, and how internet governance processes should be institutionalized in an open and inclusive manner through multistakeholder participation. One of the main outcomes of the Summit was the creation of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF[7]), which, since 2006, has served as the main open forum for such dialogue among all interested stakeholders.

The launch of these initiatives has *de facto* institutionalized international cooperation in the digital domain. Consequently, all global actors, including the EU and its Member States, have started engaging in these new global processes in accordance with their own foundational values and national priorities (Mueller 2010). At the same time, they had to face the transnational nature of the internet and, more specifically, the extraterritorial effect and other kinds of deliberate or serendipitous externalities of internet-related public or private policies and actions. Since this early stage, the global governance of the internet is still clustered around a series of contentious topics that have not yet found long-term solutions. Data protection, data trade, core functions of the internet architecture, intellectual property rights, electronic surveillance, net neutrality, human rights, and the digital divide have traditionally characterized negotiations in the domain of internet governance. Following decades of generalized optimism on the beneficial impact of the internet on society, politics and economy, concerns emerged also on the potential threats of the internet, and, in recent years, the major emphasis has been on cybersecurity, Artificial Intelligence, algorithmic governance, platform regulation and digital sovereignty. We classify these issues and the disruptions they create into four main categories:

---

[7] See the IGF website at: https://www.intgovforum.org/.

Governance disruptions include all the transformations related to state and non-state agents involved in internet governance, including who they are, what is their nature and relevance, what are their strategies, how they coalesce or divide, what kind of relationships they establish among them, how they proceed to advance their views, and, ultimately, how power relations are transforming globally in political and institutional terms. Such agents include state and non-state (civil society, business sector) actors, as well as more inconspicuous actors in this field, such as technical or other epistemic communities, courts, parliaments, regulatory agencies, and intergovernmental organizations. Not only human, organizational and institutional actors, but also artifactual agents need to be studied and understood, such as internet governance processes and instruments, including architectures, protocols and algorithms.

Democracy disruptions relate to the transformation of national and international hard and soft law, regulation, and private practices, and how they may impact, in the online environment: the substance of human rights and their balance in a democratic society; the rule of law principle; and the democratic values of legitimacy, transparency, accountability, participation and fairness. This involves procedural as well as substantive transformations and includes, *inter alia*, the transfer of some states' responsibilities and prerogatives to private intermediaries, the practice of profiling (by private and public actors for marketing and security purposes, respectively) and the datafication trends.

Economy disruptions, where we include all transformations pertaining to trade, finance and taxation, economy, as well as labor and working conditions, mostly relate to the challenges and opportunities of the 'Uberisation' or so-called sharing economy and its many business and marketing models (Marsden 2015). They also relate to the outsourcing of certain (not necessarily digital, e.g. after-sale services and various hotlines) economic activities when this is made possible by digitization.

Geopolitics disruptions relate to the transformations of the global digital geopolitical order. Issues such as network neutrality and the so-called fragmentation of the internet need to be

addressed here as a dialectic movement between globalization and renationalization of the digitized world. In addition, transformations in international development and international development aid (especially the emergence of private initiatives, alone or in coordination with state actors) are also part of this category: global internet access, zero-rating policies, their impact on public policies as well as the transformed kinds of digital divides they may lead to, need also to be studied from the point of view of the new (digital) world (dis)orders they may create. The multiple dimensions of cybersecurity also fall into the category of geopolitical disruptions, as do the provision, control or prohibition of specific technologies and equipment, such as those used for surveillance, including biometrics.

Many aspects of these four categories of disruptions are the subjects of academic research, as part of profound mutations carrying important implications far beyond the sole online domain: platformization and datafication of the economic and social life, from social networks to the so-called sharing economy; multistakeholderisation of the institutional governance processes, where various categories of stakeholders are involved, together with nation states, in policy arenas and decision-making related to several diplomatic issues; renormativisation, or the re-organization and the reformulation of normative frameworks, following the increasing role of private actors; and fragmentation, the process by which access to the global internet becomes subject to barriers to entry, whether such barriers are of a technical, legal, economic or social nature and whether their purpose is to discriminate access to infrastructure, software, applications, services or usages. However, analyzing governance, democracy, economy and geopolitics mutations to fully understand them in their systemic nature and to unfold their consequences requires a highly multidisciplinary approach, that we identify as the first component of an Internet Diplomacy research agenda.

The Changing Nature of Diplomacy

These digital disruptions and their effects resonate with diplomatic transformations, as observed in the dedicated literature. Contemporary diplomacy has itself been facing multiple challenges due to the combination of globalization and, more recently, digitalization (Hocking and Melissen 2015). As analyzed by Pouliot and Cornut (2015), the very nature of diplomacy is changing, along different characteristics:

Diplomacy Agents: diplomats are no longer only official governmental agents, but also different categories of state and non-state actors interacting with foreign affairs officials as well as among themselves. In this respect, Wiseman argues (2004) that polylateralism constitutes a third form or dimension of diplomacy, in addition to bilateralism and multilateralism. The internet governance world prefers the related concept of multistakeholderism (ITU 2013), coined in management circles, most notably the Davos World Economic Forum (WEF), with the stakeholder theory having been developed by Klaus Schwab in 1971 at the WEF foundation. The concept also found its way to the UN and its agencies and bodies, where it is centered on states as central agents, rather than on corporations, as initially envisioned by Schwab (Gleckman 2012). Multistakeholderism has now widely spread, as both a concept and a mechanism, in internet governance as well as in almost all global governance fields (Scholte 2020).

Diplomacy Fields: diplomacy has developed over time, from strict foreign affairs negotiations as an alternative to war, into a myriad of formal and informal discussions on almost any matter, especially with globalization. While the initial *Raison d'État* is often still the ultimate objective of diplomacy, it is no longer restricted to the security field and now encompasses many other components for the stability of a nation and the welfare of its citizens, including economic and social wealth, access to critical resources, and access to knowledge (Cooper, Heine, and Thakur 2013a). Moreover, in addition to narrow nation state objectives have now come global concerns regarding future generations, such as environmental issues and, in particular, global warming. One of the consequences of this evolution is that diplomacy now requires many more skills, particularly

in science and technology, than foreign affairs personnel are taught in diplomatic academies (Mayer, Carpes, and Knoblich 2014).

Diplomacy Processes, Practices and Means: Diplomacy as discourse, communication and negotiation between professional diplomats in dedicated settings is now only part of the diplomatic activity. Huge varieties of practices and means exist (ITU 2013), which are in constant development as cultural and intercultural mediations, as well as interpersonal relationships, playing an increasingly important part in diplomacy, including cooking and hospitality (Neumann 2011), fine arts, music (Ramel and Prévost-Thomas, 2018), and sports (Frank 2012), and are considered as part of the full range of diplomacy processes. Among the many examples of such diversification, public diplomacy and humanitarianism must be highlighted as forms of direct reach to people of foreign nations, most notably when usual diplomatic discussions avenues are difficult or entirely cut (e.g. public diplomacy has been practiced by the United States since the beginning of the Cold War; International humanitarianism intensively developed since the 70s and 80s, after the 'foreign humanitarian intervention' doctrine was developed by the 'French doctors' during the war in Biafra, and the USAID Agency was created in 1961). In recent years, there have been two particular moments where both public diplomacy and humanitarianism (sometimes in the form of development aid directly targeting civil society groups) played a major role before, during, and after the event: the collapse of the Berlin Wall leading to the end of Cold War in 1989, and the Arab uprisings in 2011. In both cases, communication means were especially addressed and used, e.g. radio in the former case (Cummings 2009), internet and, particularly, social networks in the latter (Clinton 2010). More generally, after the Cold War, the European Union exerted a significant role in stabilizing and democratizing Europe's Neighborhood through the use of its soft power, becoming in the space of a few years, a magnet of security with strong attractive power.

The mutations described so far are at the center of discussions[8] and analyses trying to clarify the concepts characterizing contemporary diplomacy, which remains fuzzy and overlapping. For instance, 'public diplomacy', 'science diplomacy' and 'digital diplomacy' are often used interchangeably, without having been clearly defined and delimited (Cooper, Heine, and Thakur 2013b). While digital diplomacy for some aims at specifically addressing diplomacy objectives and practices in an age characterized by numerous digital innovations, public diplomacy and science diplomacy have an older history not necessarily linked to the digital era. Science diplomacy, in particular, has recently received renewed interest, with various attempts to define and flesh out the concept by, most notably, The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and The Royal Society - UK National Academy of Science, and, as some chapters in this volume show, global internet governance may also be analyzed as one of a 'science in diplomacy' issues, i.e. global issues with scientific basis and the scientific/technical aspects of formal diplomatic processes (The Royal Society 2010; Turekian et al. 2015). This undoubtedly demonstrates a political will to give a new impetus to diplomacy in the contemporary context.

As part of its innovative nomination of a 'digital ambassador to the Internet giants' in 2017, Denmark has been particularly creative when coining a new concept of contemporary diplomacy to deal with Internet Diplomacy beyond its instrumental dimension of the use of digital means by diplomats: that of 'technological diplomacy', or 'Techplomacy' to use the portmanteau branded as a banner by the forerunner in the field, Casper Klynge, the former Danish ambassador in charge of these matters. We identify this promise of innovative diplomatic practices, one could even say of rupture, as a further development of an Internet Diplomacy Research Agenda.

More specifically, while, since 2017, other countries have nominated ambassadors in charge of digital affairs, almost none of them follow the Danish model. Under the French model, for

---

[8] See for instance discussions organized by The AAAS Center for Science Diplomacy (https://www.aaas.org/programs/center-science-diplomacy), The USC Annenberg's Center on Public Diplomacy (https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/) or The Diplo Foundation (https://www.diplomacy.edu/), or at the Clingendael Institute (https://www.clingendael.org/), to only name a few.

instance, the digital ambassador is one of the 21 (as of June 2021) thematic ambassadors appointed by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. His mission covers the full digital governance spectrum of issues, including participation in bilateral, multilateral and multistakeholder discussions on digital affairs. Given the current ambassador's public entrepreneur profile, who theorized the notion of 'Platform State' (Pezziardi and Verdier 2017), Henri Verdier's mission has extended to the development of Gov/Civic Tech tools tackling global issues, such as the fight against disinformation. In the Australian model, also adopted by Estonia and Finland, the role of the digital ambassador sticks more to classic regalian diplomacy, with cybersecurity issues being at the heart of the mission. Such different visions, models and strategies of 'techplomacy' vary considerably with the underpinning political orientation of the government defining them and appointing the ambassador. The diplomatic style and practices are also shaped by the ambassador in place, and the person's own background and culture. As a matter of fact, the new Danish digital ambassador, Anne Marie Engtoft Larsen, took office in October 2020. One would think that Danish 'techplomacy' would continue on the same line, but, in the meantime, the Liberals have been replaced by the Social Democrats in the affairs of the country, and the words of the new Danish Foreign Minister, Jeppe Kofod, in the nomination press release dated 22 August, 2020, suggested that a political shift may be coming, promising a 'Techplomacy 2.0'. It remains to be seen whether the 'Tech for Democracy 2.0' initiative launched by the Danish government in June 2021[9] will indeed lead to a new strategy and a new start for the Danish technological diplomacy.

While, with various strengths depending on the 'Techplomacy' model, polylateralism and the role of private players as a power in international relations remain an inexorable trend, to the extent that a strong 'porosity' exists between the tech giants and the diplomatic world: for instance, Nick Clegg, the UK Deputy Prime Minister 2010-2015, joined Facebook in 2018 as Vice President for Global Affairs and Communication, and Casper Klynge, the first Danish Tech ambassador

---

[9] See https://um.dk/en/foreign-policy/tech-for-democracy-2021/

2017-2020, joined Microsoft in 2020 as Vice President for European Government Affairs. Exploring all such cases and identifying whether this trend is simply 'revolving doors' as usual or a true 'Techplomacy' and 'Diplotech' encounter leading to deep mutations of diplomacy practices and outcomes must become an important strand of an Internet Diplomacy research agenda.

Organization and Contents of the Book

As a contribution to this overall research agenda, the main research questions that this volume aims to answer are: can we see an emerging Internet Diplomacy as a new diplomatic field? If so, what do we mean by Internet Diplomacy? What are the diplomatic challenges around the governance of the internet? Does Internet Diplomacy develop new models and practices in the context of diplomacy? With this book, we thus approach Internet Diplomacy beyond the instrumental use of digital technologies for diplomatic practices.

As already discussed, the book doesn't address the use of digital means by diplomats to practice a kind of 'Public Diplomacy 2.0', which is explored by scholars under 'digital diplomacy' studies (Manor 2019; Bjola and Zaiotti 2021). This volume contributes to both the scholarly conversation and the global policy developments in the field by addressing how global internet governance, including cybersecurity policies, could be framed as an Internet Diplomacy area. As a matter of fact, even beyond its cybersecurity dimension, global internet governance in all its dimensions and areas could be addressed, analyzed and assessed as a 'science diplomacy terrain' and means of 'soft power' (Nye 2004), where scientific and technical expertise join forces with political influence and diplomatic action to address global challenges. This is particularly true considering the importance of technical experts and technical organizations, recognized as a stakeholder on its own in the multistakeholder regime of global internet governance.

With this book – which is, to a large extent, the unfolding of a conversation that started in 2017 among a network of scholars interested in exploring global internet governance actors,

regulations, transactions and strategies and gathered for the first edition of the GIG-ARTS conference[10] to address global internet governance as a diplomacy issue – we have the ambition to unfold the concept of Internet Diplomacy by taking into consideration both the above-mentioned peculiarities of the emerging diplomatic practices in the governance of the internet and their outcomes in terms of normative transformations at the global, regional and national levels. In particular, with the goal to understand and formalize Internet Diplomacy across all its dimensions and from multiple interdisciplinary perspectives, this book includes contributions addressing diplomacy around the international debate on the governance of the internet. A special emphasis is given to the role of the European Union and its Member States in a field historically dominated by the US voice in the debate, due to its crucial role in the history of the internet, but also because of the leading position of the US internet giants in the global digital market. This book approaches the topic from an interdisciplinary perspective, by including contributions from leading scholars in the field of internet governance, approaching the topics from multiple backgrounds and disciplines, combining complementary novel theoretical approaches and empirically grounded research in the field of the governance of the internet as a diplomacy issue. This volume is, therefore, composed of ten chapters organized into three sections.

Section One explores how internet governance may constitute a (new) diplomacy issue in its own right, with the first three chapters respectively putting internet governance in the long-term perspective of the historical developments of diplomacy (Chapter Two by Yves Schemeil); analyzing it in relation with the two concepts of global governance and diplomacy, while taking into account specifics of the internet governance field, first and foremost the technology aspect (Chapter Three by Katharina Höne); and tracing how it has been politically constructed with different definitions, scopes and visions by the various stakeholders participating in the 10-year

---

[10] See presentation of this conference series at events.gig-arts.eu

review process of the United Nations World Summit on the Information Society (Chapter Four by Mauro Santaniello and Nicola Palladino).

Section Two more specifically analyzes whether and to what extent internet governance could serve as a science diplomacy instrument, exploring its opportunities and pitfalls through the relationships between science and authority, showing how the latter characterizes internet governance arrangements (Chapter Five by Robin E. Mansell); the comparative perspective between the US and Europe cases is explored in detail, with a focus on public diplomacy (Chapter Six by Nanette S. Levinson) and on cybersecurity policies (Chapter Seven by Francesco Amoretti and Domenico Fracchiolla).

Section Three presents four case studies allowing to address in deeper detail, through empirical research, how internet governance diplomacy may be a means for the diffusion of values, norms, and policies from some regions of the world to others where internet governance and other digital regulation is less developed, and to what extent this may impact national sovereignty. Provided cases studies cover transatlantic free trade agreements and data flows (Chapter Eight by Maria Francesca De Tullio and Giuseppe Micciarelli), the liberalization of telecommunication markets and its impact on transnational surveillance (Chapter Nine by Claire Peters), privacy and the right to be forgotten in Latin America (Chapter Ten by Jean-Marie Chenou), and international policy diffusion in the fields of copyright and privacy (Chapter Eleven by Krisztina Rozgonyi, Olga Kolokytha and Katharine Sarikakis).

With his chapter on 'Undiplomatic Ties: When Internet Blocks Intermediation', Schemeil (2022) opens the first section with a historical approach to question whether, how and to what extent the internet and its governance might – if it has not already done so - transform diplomacy, seen as relying on intermediation. Considering the highly privatized character of the internet ordering and the diversity of non-state actors intervening in its multistakeholder governance, the questioning focuses on the evolution of two main aspects of diplomacy: its practice as a formal communication process conducted by professional ambassadors in conventional settings and

following established rules; and its organization as a multilateral or bilateral negotiation process between states. The chapter then examines two hypotheses: (a) the internet as a shortcut to classical diplomacy; and (b) that internet governance could only be effective through professional intermediation. To explore these two extreme situations, the chapter provides historical developments of diplomacy and up to date analysis of internet governance processes, both of which are highly relevant for the reader to understand the dialectics of two apparently mutually exclusive processes and antagonistic concepts.

Then, in Chapter Three on 'Diplomacy and Internet Governance: a conceptual re-assessment', Höne (2022) digs deeper to conceptualize the relation between diplomacy and governance in the internet field while avoiding one concept subsuming the other. In terms of methodology, the chapter suggests thus to refer, under the governance concept, to institutions and the set of rules and norms they define and apply, and to consider diplomacy when dealing with actors and their practices. The approach particularly fits the internet field, where new categories of actors have gained a seat at the table of negotiations, making multistakeholderism a specially prominent feature in the related discussions. These new blocks of actors include private ones, such as the business sector and civil society in the same way as in some other areas, as well as individuals who may bring their expertise to the discussions, but also artifactual ones, namely the internet infrastructure itself and its protocols, leading to a situation where technological developments transform both the nature, the substance and the outcomes of the debate. Here again, the dialectic relation between diplomacy and governance is highlighted, through several examples in the internet field.

With Chapter Four on 'Discourse Coalitions in Internet Governance: Shaping Global Policy by Narratives and Definitions', Santaniello and Palladino (2022) complete this first section by providing evidence that internet governance discussions are truly a diplomatic process that aims at making different definitions, scopes and visions from various stakeholders co-exist, co-operate and inter-operate. The authors proceed through discourse analysis of different stakeholders'

contributions to the WSIS+10 review process, 10 years after the first World Summit on the Information Society held by the United Nations in 2005. The authors identify four coalitions ('neoliberal', 'sovereigntist', 'constitutional', and 'developmentalist'), providing the list of their members among the contributing stakeholders according to their own classification, and identifying the main contentious issues between them. These coalitions are, of course, ideal types defined for the sake of this analysis, and provide an empirical illustration of where main tensions and contentions lie in internet governance and how they are expressed by involved stakeholders. With this contribution, the authors shed light on the process by which actors coalesce around common narratives and eventually produce discursive orders.

Opening Section Two with her chapter on 'Science Diplomacy and Internet Governance: Opportunities and Pitfalls', Mansell (2022) starts by exploring how internet governance might be a field where science diplomacy can be deployed, especially considering its highly technological features. To this end, in particular, she examines the relationships between science (and scientists) and authority, both constituted and adaptive, where the former is predominant in science diplomacy and the latter characterizes internet governance arrangements. Here again, controversies and conflicts are traced and tackled, and attention is particularly paid to situations where academic researchers in internet governance engage in tackling socio-political challenges associated with the digital environment, and to the authoritative status of research evidence in situations where it may affect the interests of certain stakeholders. Further, taking into account the political economy of digital markets and the increasing powers of digital platform companies and their influence on the regulation and governance of the field, the author highlights how challenging the protection of citizens' interests becomes in such an environment. Science diplomacy is then discussed as a potential means of influencing diplomacy, in order to channel respect for democratic values and fundamental rights in internet governance discussions.

Still analyzing internet governance as a potential science diplomacy arena, Levinson (2022) focuses on the case of the United States with her chapter on 'Crafting Science Diplomacy In

Comparative Perspective: The Case of U.S. Internet Governance', in view of providing elements for a comparative perspective and paying particular attention to relevant cross-cultural communication and public diplomacy research and writings as well as to the public and science diplomacy practices of the United States. The author revisits, in the internet era, the US long-standing tradition of public diplomacy, arguing that the development of new media has transformed what she identifies as 'diplomacy places'. This resonates with the rise of new diplomacy actors in internet governance multistakeholder processes. Then, the chapter explores in which ways science diplomacy follows the same path, especially in the internet governance field. Comparative elements from Spanish public and science diplomacy are provided. The chapter concludes with some directions for the development of this research area.

Continuing the comparative approach, Amoretti and Fracchiolla (2022) address, in their chapter on 'Modes of Internet Governance as Science Diplomacy: What Might the EU Learn from the US Cybersecurity Policy?' more specifically cybersecurity as one of the most important issues in the internet governance field, and probably the one that most immediately illustrates how internet governance constitutes a (science) diplomacy issue. The chapter provides, with many examples, a thorough comparative analysis of US and UE cybersecurity policies, and examines common and diverging elements in their respective internet governance strategies and policies in this regard; it also analyzes the state of the Transatlantic cooperation in this field. In conclusion, the authors consider different scenarios on how the EU cybersecurity policy may develop in the future. Concluding the section on internet governance as a science diplomacy area, this chapter focusing on cybersecurity constitutes the perfect transition to Section Three, which provides case studies on internet governance diplomacy.

The first case study proposed in Section Three deals with free trade agreements and their impact on internet governance. In Chapter Eight on 'Free Trade Governance and Data Flow: the TiSA's agreement negotiation as a case for governmentality', De Tullio and Micciarelli (2022) analyze the role and position of the EU and other state and non-state actors involved in the

negotiation of free trade agreements, that led to what they call 'free trade governance'. They also discuss how new public-private institutions created by the neoliberal design of free trade agreements may affect internet governance, in that they generate a shift of power on a transnational scale, since private subjects act as real negotiators, having an authoritative substance behind their formal corporate nature. The authors more specifically consider the Trade in Services Agreement (TiSA, whose negotiations were paused following the US Presidential elections in November 2016) as a case study, to analyze how it affects crucially both political institutions and internet governance issues such as privacy and personal data protection, as well as network neutrality and transnational data flows. The study is framed in the broader theoretical background of constitutional law, governmentality studies and Foucauldian perspective.

In her chapter on 'National Sovereignty, Global Policy, and the Liberalization of Telecommunications Markets', Peters (2022) addresses, as a second case study, the consequences of the privatization of the telecom market on surveillance, with the evolution of the regime of lawful interception in Europe and of international cooperation of law enforcement authorities. By focusing on the issues of sovereignty, international cooperation, and public-private cooperation, the chapter analyzes it as an international relations issue, addressing *inter alia* the important cyber-normative field of international human rights. The author establishes a causality link between the privatization of the telecom sector and the evolution of surveillance legislation and shows how the globalization of private telecom operators led to problems with the enforcement of national laws that could only be solved through diplomacy and international standardization. An enlightening example of 'Law Enforcement Authority diplomacy' is provided with the reported FBI initiative. The detailed analysis provided in this chapter constitutes an essential tool to understand the never-ending developments in national and transnational surveillance based on telecommunication data, and the increasing issues of national sovereignty in the field.

"In this bright future you can't forget your past: debating the 'right to be forgotten' in Latin America", says Chenou (2022), who presents in his chapter an example of law and policy diffusion,

that of the EU 'Right to be forgotten' (RTBF) in Latin America. He analyses how the issue was debated and implemented in four large countries (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico), with regard to two possible conceptions of the RTBF: that of the EU and that of the US. Tracing back to the 'Costeja' case that initiated the European Court of Justice's decision on the RTBF and the subsequent EU legislation, the chapter presents and discusses the US and EU's different approaches to internet intermediaries liability, and highlights the difference in the ways of approaching the role of search engines, in this case, that is at the heart of the two competing visions of the case (data controller in the ECJ decision vs internet intermediary in the US vision contesting this decision) and, consequently, the different vision of the applicable law (EU data protection legislation vs US – as the search engine country - intermediary liability regulation). The chapter then discusses in detail the elements and tensions in this debate in the four considered Latin American countries, as regard the perspective to adopt in their legislation. Showing how these discussions were held in the shadow of EU and US (public) diplomacy and influenced by them, this chapter provides an important example of policy diffusion process and the role played by academic researchers and civil society actors in it.

In the closing chapter on 'Policy diffusion and Internet governance: reflections on copyright and privacy', Rozgonyi, Kolokytha and Sarikakis (2022) extend the elaboration of international policy diffusion processes in the field of internet governance, analyzing more specifically two case studies related to privacy (with the notion of informed consent) and copyright (with the concept of graduated response). The chapter focuses on policy transfer as a matter of foreign policy and investigates structural factors that influence this process, in particular the role of citizens' activism in international policy making. With these two selected case studies, the authors consider two emblematic 'sites of struggle' among the many characterizing internet governance contentions, that affect citizens' everyday life and their rights to access, use and generate internet content, impacting their very fundamental freedoms. As the authors argue, these cases entail policy

principles that reflect ideological dispositions about the role of the state and the market, the role

of the citizen as an actor and, ultimately, even the state of fundamental rights in a volatile world.

Bibliography

Amoretti, Francesco, and Domenico Fracchiolla. 2022. "Modes of Internet Governance as Science Diplomacy: What Might the EU Learn from the US Cyber Security Policy?" In *Internet Diplomacy: Shaping the Global Politics of Cyberspace*, edited by M. Marzouki and A. Calderaro. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Barrinha, André, and Thomas Renard. 2017. "Cyber-Diplomacy: The Making of an International Society in the Digital Age." *Global Affairs* 0 (0): 1–12.

Bjola, Corneliu, and Ruben Zaiotti. 2020. *Digital Diplomacy and International Organisations. Autonomy, Legitimacy and Contestation*. London: Routledge.

Broeders, Dennis, and Bibi van den Berg. 2020. *Governing Cyberspace. Behavior, Power and Diplomacy*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brousseau, Eric, and Meryem Marzouki. 2012. "Old Issues, New Framings, Uncertain Implications". I*n Governance, Regulation and Powers on the Internet, edited E*. Brousseau, M. Marzouki and C. Meadel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calderaro, Andrea. 2021. "Diplomacy and Responsibilities in the Transnational Governance of the Cyber Domain." In *The Routledge Handbook of Responsibility in World Politics*, edited by Hannes Hansen-Magnusson and Antje Vetterlein. London; New York: Routledge.

Calderaro, Andrea, and Anthony J. S. Craig. "Transnational Governance of Cybersecurity: Policy Challenges and Global Inequalities in Cyber Capacity Building." *Third World Quarterly* 41, no. 6 (June 2, 2020): 917–38.

Calderaro, Andrea, and Anastasia Kavada. 2013. "Challenges and Opportunities of Online Collective Action for Policy Change." *Policy & Internet* 5 (1): 1–6.

Chenou, Jean-Marie. 2022. "In This Bright Future You Can't Forget Your Past: Debating The 'Right To Be Forgotten' in Latin America." In *Internet Diplomacy: Shaping the Global Politics of Cyberspace*, edited by M. Marzouki and A. Calderaro. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Clinton, Hillary. 2010. " Remarks on Internet Freedom." *US Secretary of State Remarks given at the Washington DC Newseum,* January 21, 2010. https://2009-2017.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2010/01/135519.htm.

Cummings, Richard H. 2009. *Cold War Radio: The Dangerous History of American Broadcasting in Europe, 1950-1989.* Jefferson: McFarland & Company.

De Tullio, Maria Francesca, and Giuseppe Micciarelli. 2022. "Trade Agreements and Internet Governance: Data Flow and Politics in the TiSA's Governmental Rationality." In *Internet Diplomacy: Shaping the Global Politics of Cyberspace*, edited by M. Marzouki and A. Calderaro. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

DiploFoundation. n.d. "Digital Diplomacy Project". Accessed June 11, 2021. https://www.diplomacy.edu/e-diplomacy.

Frank, Robert. 2012. "Internationalisation du sport et diplomatie sportive." In *Pour l'histoire des relations internationales*, edited by R. Frank. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Gleckman, Harris. 2012. *Readers' Guide: Global Redesign Initiative.* Boston: University of Massachusetts Boston's Center for Governance and Sustainability. https://www.umb.edu/editor_uploads/gri_uploads/An_Overview_of_WEFs_Perspective.pdf.

Hocking, Brian, and Jan Melissen. 2015. "*Diplomacy in the Digital Age.*" The Hague: Clingendael Institute. https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/2016-02/Digital_Diplomacy_in_the_Digital%20Age_Clingendael_July2015.pdf.

Höne, Katharina 2022. "Diplomacy and Internet Governance: a conceptual re-assessment." In *Internet Diplomacy: Shaping the Global Politics of Cyberspace*, edited by M. Marzouki and A. Calderaro. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

ITU. 2013. "Multistakeholderism in Internet Governance: The Importance of the Tunis Agenda." ITU News 2013, no.5 (June-July): 32-33. http://handle.itu.int/11.1004/020.3000/ITU011-2013-05-en.

Jarlner, Michael, and Thomas Østerlin Koch. 2017. "Danmark får som det første land i verden en digital ambassadør." *Politiken,* January 27, 2017. http://politiken.dk/udland/art5806849/Danmark-f%C3%A5r-som-det-f%C3%B8rste-land-i-verden-en-digital-ambassad%C3%B8r.

Kaltofen, Carolin, and Michele Acuto. "Science Diplomacy: Introduction to a Boundary Problem." *Global Policy* 9, no. S3 (2018): 8–14.

Levinson, Nanette L. 2022. "Crafting Science Diplomacy In Comparative Perspective: The Case of U.S. Internet Governance." In *Internet Diplomacy: Shaping the Global Politics of Cyberspace*, edited by M. Marzouki and A. Calderaro. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Levinson, Nanette S., and Meryem Marzouki. 2015. "Internet Governance Institutionalization: Process and Trajectories." In *Global Governance Facing Structural Changes: New Institutional*

Trajectories in the Internet Era, edited by M. Rioux and K. Fontaine-Skronski. Palgrave-MacMillan, New York

Manor, Ilan. 2019. *The Digitalization of Public Diplomacy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mansell, Robin E. 2022. "Science Diplomacy and Internet Governance: Opportunities and Pitfalls." In *Internet Diplomacy: Shaping the Global Politics of Cyberspace*, edited by M. Marzouki and A. Calderaro. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Marsden, Paul. 2015. "The 10 Business Models of Digital Disruption (and how to respond to them)." Last modified August 26, 2015. Accessed June 11, 2021. https://digitalwellbeing.org/the-10-business-models-of-digital-disruption-and-how-to-respond-to-them/.

Nye, Joseph S. 2004. *Soft Power: The Means To Success In World Politics*. New York: PublicAffairs.

Peters, Claire. 2022. "National Sovereignty, Global Policy, and the Liberalization of Telecommunications Markets." In *Internet Diplomacy: Shaping the Global Politics of Cyberspace*, edited by M. Marzouki and A. Calderaro. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Pezziardi, Pierre, and Henri Verdier. 2017. *Des startups d'État à l'État plateforme*. Paris: Fondation pour l'innovation politique.

Pouliot, Vincent, and Jérémie Cornut. 2015. "Practice Theory and the Study of Diplomacy: A Research Agenda." *Cooperation and Conflict* 50, no.3 (September): 297-315. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836715574913.

Ramel, Frédéric, and Cécile Prévost-Thomas, eds. 2018. *International Relations, Music and Diplomacy. Sounds and Voices on the International Stage*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rozgonyi, Krisztina, Olga Kolokytha and Katharine Sarikakis. 2022. "Policy diffusion and Internet governance: reflections on copyright and privacy." In *Internet Diplomacy: Shaping the Global Politics of Cyberspace*, edited by M. Marzouki and A. Calderaro. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Santaniello, Mauro, and Nicola Palladino. 2022. "Discourse Coalitions in *Internet Governance: Shaping Global Policy by Narratives and Definitions." In Internet Diplomacy: Shaping the Global Politics of Cyberspace*, edited by M. Marzouki and A. Calderaro. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Schemeil, Yves. 2022. "Undiplomatic Ties: When Internet Blocks Intermediation." In *Internet Diplomacy: Shaping the Global Politics of Cyberspace*, edited by M. Marzouki and A. Calderaro. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Schemeil, Yves, and Anna Jeannesson. 2016. "The Politics and Diplomacy of Cooking and Hospitality". Future Learn MOOC. https://www.futurelearn.com/courses/geopolitics-hospitality.

Scholte, Jan Aart. 2005. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. 2Rev Ed edition. New York, NY: Red Globe Press.

The Royal Society. 2010. *New Frontiers in science diplomacy: navigating the changing balance of power*. London: The Royal Society. https://royalsociety.org/~/media/Royal_Society_Content/policy/publications/2010/429496 9468.pdf.

Thomson, Janice E. 1995. "State Sovereignty in International Relations: Bridging the Gap Between Theory and Empirical Research." *International Studies Quarterly* 39 (2): 213–33.

Turekian, Vaughan C., Sarah Macindoe, Daryl Copeland, Lloyd S. Davis, Robert G. Patman, and Maria Pozza. 2015. "The Emergence of Science Diplomacy." In *Science Diplomacy: New Day or False Dawn?*, edited by L. S. Davis and R. G. Patman. London: World Scientific Publishing.

UN. 2018. SG/A/1817 *Secretary-General Appoints High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation*. New York; UN.

UNGA. 2018. A/RES/73/27 *Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security*. New York: UN.

WGIG. 2005. *Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance*. Geneva: ITU. http://www.itu.int/net/wsis/wgig/docs/wgig-report.pdf.

Wiseman, Geoffrey. 2004. "'Polylateralism' and new modes of global dialogue." In *Diplomacy: Problems and Issues in Contemporary Diplomacy*, edited by C. Jönsson and R. Langhorne. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Zürn, Michael. 2018. *A Theory of Global Governance: Authority, Legitimacy, and Contestation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.