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Geneva, October 2011
**DiploFoundation (Diplo)** is a non-profit organisation created in November 2002 by the governments of Malta and Switzerland. Diplo developed out of a project to introduce information and communication technologies into the practice of diplomacy, initiated in 1992 at the Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies in Malta.

Diplo works to address the gap between the limited capacities and the growing needs of small and developing states, as well as marginalised groups, for meaningful participation in global policy processes. It offers online courses in diplomacy, and capacity development programmes which combine high quality online and face-to-face courses and seminars, policy research in real contexts, and policy immersion (e.g. internships). Diplo also develops online tools for distance learning, knowledge sharing, and e-participation.

Diplo has received wide recognition for its work, including consultative status with the United Nations, the World E-democracy award 2009 and the hosting of the 2010 annual meeting of the International Forum on Diplomatic Training (the forum of directors of diplomatic academies and institutes).

**Dr Jovan Kurbalija** is the founding director of DiploFoundation. He is a former diplomat with a professional and academic background in international law, diplomacy and information technology. In 1992 he established the Unit for IT and Diplomacy at the Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies in Malta. In 2002, after 10 years of success in education, research and publishing, the unit evolved into DiploFoundation. Dr Kurbalija currently directs online learning courses on ICT and diplomacy and lectures in academic and training institutions in Switzerland, the United States, Austria, Belgium the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Malta. His main areas of research are diplomacy and Internet governance, e-diplomacy, online negotiations, and diplomatic law.

---

**What is the difference between training and capacity development?**

The terms ‘training’ and ‘capacity development’ are sometimes confused or used interchangeably. E-diplomacy illustrates very well the difference between training and capacity development. Training is just one element of capacity development. It usually focuses on providing skills for specific problems (e.g. using Facebook or Twitter). Capacity development encompasses a whole range of activities designed to empower individuals and institutions (including the analysis of policy contexts, awareness building, institutional adjustments, policy research, policy immersion and more). In Diplo programmes, training is embedded within a broad set of activities, carefully designed to take into account the local cultural, policy and organisational context.
In diplomacy, the gap between what is thought and what is learnt is can be quite wide. When we add the prefix ‘e’ to diplomacy, the gap between what is thought and what is learned becomes even wider. A ‘cognitive illusion’ is triggered by a very low entry point into e-diplomacy and a very high bar for making e-diplomacy communication effective.

While we can learn to write a blog, or use Twitter or Facebook in a few hours, maximum one day, we need much longer, at least one month, to understand the social media milieu and how to frame messages and interact with others; and much longer still to embed new ways of working into a team or an organisation. The proper use of social media requires changes in personal habits and institutional routines. This is the reason why efficient use of social media cannot be instilled with certainty with a few training sessions.
Diplo’s e-diplomacy curriculum consists of the following three areas:

- The first is the changing environment for diplomatic activities, which includes ICT-driven changes in the modern economy, sovereignty, and the concept of power.
- The second relates to new topics on diplomatic agendas, such as Internet governance.
- The third area focuses on the impact of the Internet on the emergence of new tools for diplomatic activities.

This presentation will focus on one specific segment of e-diplomacy: the use of social media as a new tool for diplomatic activities.
This **Success drawing** reminds me of a question on my entrance exam to diplomacy in the former Yugoslavia. A member of the examination board pushed a paper across the table and asked me to connect two dots *diplomatically*. The absurdity of the question helped me to answer it 'correctly'.

Straight lines are a simple visualisation of our rational and scientific approach to life and planning. The further we move from science to real life, the more the lines bend. A new curve is formed in the line by each requirement of emotions and perceptions, institutional dynamics, and politics, to name a few.

Recently, I discussed with colleagues the limits of planning in social media projects. In social media, which, of course, is very 'social', the lines are rarely straight. The usefulness of planning is limited. At the same time, we have to plan, since the success of a social media campaign depends on it being well-organised and sustained. It is a paradoxical situation or yet another confirmation of Niels Bohr's famous quote:

*Profound truths are recognised by the fact that the opposite is also a profound truth, in contrast to trivialities where opposites are obviously absurd.*
Before we start the discussion on capacity development for social media, we need to know why social media should be used in diplomacy at all.

**Influence decision-shaping**

Social media plays an increasingly important role in decision-shaping. If governments want to influence policy in its formative stage, i.e. before it arrives on negotiations tables, they need to be active in social media spaces, discussing policy issues. Social media influences decision-shaping directly and indirectly.

*Directly,* many diplomats use Wikipedia as their main source of information in their daily work. Wikipedia provides comprehensive and up-to-date coverage of the main diplomatic events and policy developments. Very often, Wikipedia contains first-hand information from people on the ground. Only a few diplomatic services can provide coverage of international events comparable to Wikipedia. Of course, it is necessary to check information gathered from Wikipedia by comparing it to information from other sources. Blogs are another source of direct influence on decision-shaping. The most important blogs are written by respected and authoritative authors. Blogs are particularly influential in specialised policy fields such as climate change, migration, and food security. They increasingly shape agendas in international negotiations. For more information please consult: *Annex: Impact of social media on climate change diplomacy.*
Indirectly, social media influences traditional media. Journalists use social media as a source in preparing their articles, TV coverage, and other media artifacts. A recent example is the killing of Gaddafi, where the main media built their stories around video footage, photos, and tweets made by people who were on the ground in Libya. No media team could provide such direct, sometimes too direct, media coverage. And unless diplomats and governments are fully prepared, the agenda can run away with them, as was the case in Tunisia, Egypt, and Bahrain, where activists and supporters, skilled in using social media, set the news agenda by their intense levels of activity and well-organised sharing of videos and pictures (sometimes apparently doctored or copied from previous campaigns).

Use for public diplomacy

Social media is a key tool for public diplomacy. It has wide outreach across the globe. It is intensively used by countries with global diplomatic interests and presence. The United States and the United Kingdom are leaders in the field of public diplomacy. Both of them use Facebook, Twitter, and blogs effectively to address the global public.

Communication in crisis situations

Social media has proven to be highly effective in crisis situations. A crisis situation – natural or political – affects a broad range of people, and communication is an essential part of dealing with any crisis situation. Faced with danger, people organise themselves by using, very often in innovative ways, all available e-tools including mobile phones, Twitter, and Facebook. In the case of natural disasters, notable examples were the Asian Tsunami, and the earthquakes in Chile and Haiti. In political crisis situations, an effective use of e-tools is the Arab Spring. In many recent political changes in Eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa, social media have played a central role. All of these examples demonstrate an essential role for social media in diplomatic services, whether they are involved in humanitarian assistance, support for their citizens, conflict prevention or other situations.

Connecting with the diaspora

The Internet and social media have revolutionised the relationship between the diaspora and their home country. Previously sporadic contacts have evolved into an almost constant presence. In this time of financial crisis, with a growing importance of remittances, the migrants’ role in the political and social life in their home country has been increasing in importance. The use of social media for connecting the diaspora provides a lot of potential. It is still an under-utilised area of e-diplomacy, although there are some examples of it being used. The UK and USA are using Facebook in a big way to connect with expatriates, both giving information and providing a place for conversation (https://www.facebook.com/ukinbahrain/)
Engage domestic public in foreign policy

With the line blurring between foreign and domestic policy, it is highly relevant to have effective communication with the domestic public about foreign policy. Social media can help in engaging national research centres, universities and other important players in discussions on foreign policy matters.
Typically, organisations tend to look for simpler and cheaper solutions. One solution for social media is to establish a basic technical infrastructure and provide technical training. This approach is not sufficient. It rarely works and in most cases leads towards failed e-projects. An effective social media communication requires a comprehensive capacity development programme and, very often, institutional changes.

The real challenge for any e-diplomacy project is addressing the fact that its proper implementation may affect some pillars of the organisational and professional culture (e.g. strict hierarchy, risk avoidance – see page 17).
Effective e-diplomacy capacity development has to be comprehensive, and should be delivered in three main phases, roughly described as one day – one month – one year.

An average Internet user needs a maximum of one day to establish and start using the main social media services, including Facebook, Twitter, blogs and YouTube. Most e-diplomacy and social media training focuses on this one-day aspect by training participants how to open an account, create their first blog/tweet and perform a few basic operations (e.g. finding friends on Facebook, retweeting on Twitter). This is a necessary phase, but it is not sufficient for the implementation of social media in e-diplomacy. For the effective use of social media as a successful communication channel in diplomacy, there is a need for comprehensive capacity development which lasts up to one year.
ONE DAY - learn how to use it technically

At the end of the workshop participants will be able to...

• Open Facebook/Twitter/YouTube account
• Post messages/tweet/video
• Use advanced function (re-tweet, set privacy settings in Facebook)
• Know what they do not know in social media

ONE DAY – face-to-face workshop

• One facilitator per 10 participants
• Adjust training to participants’ Internet background
• Presentation followed by practical exercises
With the acquired skill-set (one day), e-diplomats can start using social media. They have learned how to walk, but they cannot yet run. In order to learn how to run, e-diplomats, in our experience, need at least one month, perhaps spread over a longer period of time. The first step is to train users to learn how to use social media. There are many challenges to overcome.

Learning and using language provides us with a useful analogy. How many of you have been in a situation where you have learnt some phrases in a language, tried them out in a real context, and been totally flummoxed by the reaction? As well as the enormous variety of language responses from native speakers to a simple phrase like, ‘which way is the station’, there is an even larger body of cultural norms and practices which underpin the use of language, and which takes far longer to understand and appreciate.

In the same way, to learn how to engage with other users of social media, to enter into the conversational, direct, friendly, light style of many social media, we need to immerse ourselves in the culture. Follow one or two bloggers or tweeters and see how they communicate and engage, for example, or track the activities of a well-rehearsed communications department by tracing the echoes of an official visit through the different social and other media channels. There is a wide set of diplomacy-related exercises which could be used as the backbone for a one-month online coaching and training course.
Preferable scenario: Organise an introductory two-day workshop, followed by one month of online class practice and coaching.

Possible scenario: Organise online sessions and coaching.

Characteristics of a one-month training course:
- Require participants to dedicate 7 hours weekly
- Start with a hand-holding approach by facilitators that evolves into independent learning
- Provide daily support for online coaching
- Build exercises around activities of direct relevance for diplomats’ daily work
Without this one-year approach, which should create a friendly institutional environment for e-diplomacy, all other training efforts will have very limited impact. Back to the comic strip from the first slide: even if an e-diplomat learns what is taught, he might not be able to use it due to institutional limitations. It won’t benefit anyone; neither the diplomatic service, nor the trained e-diplomat.

Institutions have to learn to manage the risks that e-communication brings. The main problem is that it cannot be solved in the way institutions usually do this. One cannot simply issue a new organisational order requiring all ambassadors and diplomats to write a certain number of blog posts and tweets, and authorising them officially to take the risk. All current experience shows that an e-diplomacy infrastructure should be developed gradually, with a lot of patience.

Some practices in an introduction to e-diplomacy are gradually crystallised. For example, it is essential that e-diplomacy initiatives have support from the top echelon of the ministry. It helps if the minister tweets, as is the case with Sweden, Bahrain, and a few other countries. Even more, the leadership of the organisation must take concrete steps to promote e-participation. It should ensure the necessary resources. It should also add successful e-diplomacy ‘career accelerators’. It should plan for potential e-diplomacy failures with the necessary care and not push diplomats into the risk-avoidance inertia which is typical for diplomatic services. It should encourage experimentation, another concept which sometimes conflicts with the traditional professional culture in diplomacy. One successful example of creative and effective leadership is Hillary Clinton, who has supported e-diplomacy in the US State Department in a very substantive way. It is not surprising that the US is among the leaders in e-diplomacy.
The minister and other top officials of the diplomatic service should be involved in awareness-building sessions focusing on very concrete examples of how e-diplomacy can help them. Risks and dangers should not be hidden! The ‘converted’ members of the upper echelons should be assisted through personal coaching which, in an ideal scenario, should empower them as e-diplomats as well. Awareness-building sessions should be organised with a full understanding of institutional dynamics and culture, in order to avoid the risk to reputation, which remains highly relevant in hierarchical organizations such as diplomatic services.

The main challenge is to convince the middle tier which carries the functional dynamics of diplomatic services. They are often under a lot of pressure and they have to see the direct benefit of any innovation, including e-diplomacy, in order to be convinced. The awareness-building and training for them will have to be developed around concrete situations that they face in their daily work. A few possibilities include more efficient ways of drafting diplomatic documents (a core diplomatic function), finding information, and creating a friendlier public policy environment for their initiatives (reduce waste of time and possible misunderstandings). Practical and successful case studies are the best way to get middle management enthusiastic about e-diplomacy.
Counter-intuitive nature of social media

Our intuitive approach is to passively use the Internet by browsing and expecting to get information without any active thought or creative process. Social media is the opposite. It requires active and creative engagement. We have to read, write, connect various ideas, and understand other people. We have to be mentally alert, which is not often the case while we are browsing the Internet. The only way to be successful is to establish new routines and habits. As we know, this is not easy. It is particularly difficult for digital migrants (older than 30), who have to learn new tricks. The bad news is that there are no shortcuts. We have to exercise a lot of self-discipline and introduce e-routines using specific times during the day for following social media, writing blogs, and tweeting. The key is regularity, which gradually evolves into routine and ultimately becomes an internalised skill.

Dealing with diverse national, professional and social cultures

The main challenge starts with engaging a wider audience, including civil society, academia, and others with whom diplomats must increasingly communicate in dealing with issues such as climate change, human rights, and migration. Here, the e-diplomat has to learn how to communicate in an engaging way, while making sure that he or she stays within the policy parameters of their country.
In line with the culture outlined above, and assisted perhaps by younger members of the ministry, diplomats can experiment in two areas:

1. The primary currency of social media is ‘content objects’: discrete items of information, such as Internet links, photos, video clips, or quotes. These are posted (published) and then shared with other people on the user network. If the content object is sufficiently moving – interesting, funny, alarming, scandalous, for example – then it will be shared, passed on, by others in the network. This is the essence of viral communication. The challenge is to create, or identify, and deliver content that moves people, who will then forward it around the Web.

2. Conversation is the predominant mode of engaging with other people using social media. Organisations who try to broadcast through social media fail. Accordingly, diplomats should engage with people they meet in the course of their work, using the normal range of social chat and exchange with which they are familiar from their cocktail and reception circles. One challenge for diplomats is to engage with non-diplomats who don’t use the same nuances and codes that they do.

**Social media and diplomatic ‘credentials’**

We can see from the most successful e-diplomats that they apply traditional rules of diplomatic etiquette to avoid discussing potentially controversial issues, such as religion or disease. It is safer to talk about art, literature, music, or the weather, particularly if you are in the UK. Most e-diplomatic blogs centre on these topics. They often make interesting reading, because diplomats posted abroad are a very good observers of local society. They are close enough to understand local dynamics, and distanced enough to have an objective view. This unique skill of diplomats was clearly shown in the WikiLeaks cables that showed high-quality anthropological and social analysis prepared by US diplomats posted in countries worldwide.

However, sooner or later, diplomats have to face controversial topics. They are like lightning rods for critics of their own countries, for whatever reason, starting from serious ones such as abuse of human rights to less politically controversial ones such as environmental practice or economic policy. Here, the traditional communication style of press releases or sending documents does not work. In the social media space, issuing press releases is usually a suicidal move. This type of tweet or blog is ignored. Ultimately, they are counter-productive because e-diplomats lose their ‘social media credentials’, their necessary following, and ultimately, their influence in the social media space. In covering controversial issues for their country, the e-diplomat has to exercise excellent writing, political, and social media skills. Such writings should be factual but not dry. They should engage the audience without being caught on the wrong foot or being misquoted.
Digital migrants and digital natives in diplomacy

Today, most junior diplomats are digital natives (younger than 30). They grew up with computers and developed habits to interact in social media. They should be the workhorses of e-diplomacy projects. Their training should focus more on diplomacy than on e-, or to be more precise, on how to put e- and diplomacy together. They should also be alerted about institutional and professional dynamics. While their enthusiasm should provide the energy for an e-diplomacy project, it should also be guided in order to avoid creating unnecessary institutional disturbances. ‘A dead pioneer is not of use to anyone.’

Hierarchy of diplomatic services and bottom-up nature of social media

Hierarchy is essential for diplomacy not only in the formal organisation, but also in establishing the pecking order in a system where more seniority is achieved in the narrower organisational pyramid. For an average diplomatic service, only 10% of junior diplomats will achieve the rank of ambassador. Such high sensitivity for career progression causes many aspects of professional and social life to be viewed in the context of the pecking order. They include the importance of the posting country (USA, UN, China are usually among top-10 postings), political desk in the ministry, position and size of the office. In contrast, everyone starts on an equal footing on Twitter and acquires leadership authority through the development of a strong following. Any e-diplomacy implementation project should deal with a potential tension between the strict hierarchy of diplomacy and the networking nature of diplomatic services. Some creative solutions, such as the use of e-diplomacy as one of elements for career promotion, could be used.

High importance of ‘unspoken’ in diplomacy vs explicit nature of social media

Diplomacy is a profession of rituals with high importance attached to unspoken communication. Diplomatic signals are sent through body language, presence at events, and behavior in diplomatic rituals. ‘Unspoken communication’ is important for the internal organisation of diplomatic services. A lot is implied through behaviour and signalled in various ways. This does not create a friendly environment for social media, which requires a higher level of openness and transparency both in communication and in intentions. Obviously, social media, like any other communication medium, could be used for sending signals and messages hidden in the main message. It remains to see how this ‘unspoken’ element of diplomatic communication will develop in social media spaces, both within diplomatic services (Intranet) and on the global Internet.

Being similar and being different

To be the same (to belong to the group) and to be the different (to be unique) is one of our human predicaments and a source of constant tension in our lives. In
diplomacy it is even stronger. From the time they join the diplomatic service and move from jeans to suits, diplomats always try to show that they belong to the 'diplomatic guild'. It is key to be perceived as 'one of us'. This identity is very often developed by emphasising contrast to others outside the ministry and highlighting the elitist aspect of the profession. Uniformity is usually a safe career path. Diplomats try to achieve respect from their peers. At the same time, diplomats want 'to be different'. They have to make themselves noticed in order to ensure a proper career, especially in the inevitable future 'narrowing of hierarchical pyramid'. How to be seen (different), while not over-exposed (remain the same) is one of the challenges for all diplomats. This challenge acquires a new twist with the introduction of social media, which by its nature implies over-exposure.
Concluding remarks

- Social media is here to stay
- Invasion of diplomacy by ‘digital natives’
- Need to preserve core values of diplomacy

THE MORE DIPLOMACY CHANGES,
THE MORE IT STAYS THE SAME

Smart use of smart tools saves time & enables effective diplomacy
Q: Is technology bad or good? Does it pose a threat for humanity?

A: The short answer is that technology is neither good nor bad – nor is it neutral (Kranzberg’s First Law). Let me explain why this statement is not as contradictory as it looks at first glance. Technology is not inherently bad or good. It can be used for bad or good purposes. Twitter has been used both for good causes (coordinating humanitarian assistance in Haiti) and bad causes (criminal gangs’ communications). While it is not inherently good or bad, it is not neutral either. Technology influences the way we do things. Technology identifies new winners and losers. Every technology empowers some individuals, groups, regions and/or countries. In the case of the Internet it empowered individuals (Zukenberg – Facebook), groups (WikiLeaks hacker community), regions (e.g. Silicon Valley) and countries (Estonia with e-development or even ‘incidental beneficiaries’ through country code abbreviations such as Tuvalu – .tv and Montenegro – .me).

Q: With all the build-up of social media (Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.), pressure is increasing for people to conform to this proliferation of ‘going public’. It seems to be less and less of a personal choice and more and more group pressure to be part of ‘them’. It looks increasingly like some involuntary North Korean mind control where all of us feel obliged to go along, become traceable (this can be done already just based on simple mobile phones). Facebook records and the feeling that you must also join and share your life 24 hours a day with the “rest of the world”. How can we defend ourselves against this new menace of going public at the expense of personal freedom and privacy?

A: It seems that Orwell’s 1984 has now arrived, after some delay. The power of online surveillance threatens some of our fundamental freedoms. The more our reality is shifted to the online space, the less control we have of our data, experiences, and intimacies. They are in the cloud, left to the good intentions of owners of big companies such as Google, Amazon, and Facebook. It is a risky situation. One piece of good news is that technology also enables ways to avoid losing control of our information.

Q: How do we know what is real, what is fake, what has been manipulated?

A: As we know, there is no editorial policy on the Internet. The quality of information is very questionable and there are numerous examples of fake information and manipulation. Many of them are aimed at the reputation of a specific person. Recently, in Serbia, a group of hackers created a false Nobel Prize website and announced that the Nobel Prize winner was Dobrica Cosic, a Serbian writer. The campaign used his
obsession with the Nobel Prize as a pretext to criticise his writing, which inspired the Serbian nationalist programme in 1990s. Some information spaces, such as Wikipedia, have developed methods for data validation. Information on Wikipedia is increasingly reliable and if it is not, this is clearly stated. Generally speaking, nobody can guarantee the reliability of information on the Internet. Internet knowledge and information space is in flux. The best approach is to adjust to this fluidity as soon as possible.

Q: Many social media people commit plagiarism without even understanding fully what they are doing.

A: Plagiarism is a major problem. According to recent statistics, 85% of university students in the United States are involved in plagiarism. If 85% cannot be wrong and if the rule is right, what is wrong? The educational system? The system should make ethical behaviour both rational and pragmatic. But this is not the case in modern universities. Students are often asked to write long essays under pressure. Academic calendars are increasingly demanding. Faced with this pressure, many students opt for the rational solution which is to ‘copy and paste’ from the Internet. Can students be punished for being rational and pragmatic? Is there something wrong with the current educational system (excerpts from the full blog post).

Q: And how is it possible to protect a person's integrity when hysterical social media ‘news’ can spread in no time and kill an individual’s reputation?

A: An individual has very little means to control the spread of defamatory news on the Internet. There are some legal mechanisms but they are slow and expensive.

Q: What social media should I use?

A: The short answer is use what you are comfortable with. And a slightly longer elaboration... If you like conversations, use Facebook (also increasingly becoming a female-dominated platform – disclaimer: it is fact; no gender connotation). If you like to share, use Twitter (especially if you are a fan of Haiku :)). If you want to make coherent arguments use a blog. Since diplomats are very sensitive to written communication, my guess is that the average diplomat would be most inclined to blog where he or she can make develop their thoughts properly. Second in this list would be Twitter. I am not sure that Facebook is particularly useful for diplomats (like any other professional communication) since it blurs the line between professional and personal communication in a very risky way.
Lastly, one picture tells thousand words.....
Annex: An impact of Social Media on Climate Change Diplomacy

A survey of Internet sources that illustrate the impact of social media on climate change diplomacy.


2. Growing Role for New Media Foreseen As Climate Science/Public Opinion Diverge - http://www.yaleclimatemediaforum.org/2009/04/growing-role-for-new-media/


5. The immediacy, interactivity, and accessibility of new technologies have changed the rules of the game - http://www.themarknews.com/articles/6952-diplomacy-journalism-and-the-new-media?page=2 (Today, diplomats and journalists are only two of many sources that feed into an increasingly crowded ‘info-sphere’. Their longstanding advantages over the sourcing and control of information have disappeared. In the age of mass travel and communications, and with the exponential growth of internet use, more people are able to exchange more data and ideas with increasing speed. A substantial share of the world’s accumulated knowledge is, for the first time, available to anyone with an internet connection. Among other things, this is having the effect of breaking down barriers, blurring borders of every kind, and creating a kind of shared consciousness – a form of universal and collective intelligence that I have referred to elsewhere as the emergence of a Global Political Economy of Knowledge. Diplomats and journalists rely on the new media, often share similar reporting objectives, and frequently base their reporting on the same sources. But ultimately their purposes diverge. Journalists are interested in getting at the most compelling angle on a given story. In contrast, diplomats, by virtue of their connection to national governments, have policies to advocate and interests to advance or defend.)

6. Tapping Social Media’s Potential To Muster a Vast Green Army - http://e360.yale.edu/feature/tapping_social_medias_potential_to_muster_a_vast_green_army/2424/ (But with the explosion of cell phones equipped with digital cameras and global positioning systems, citizen science has migrated to the Web, emerging as a potent force-multiplier — and watchdog — for conservation.)
7. Climate Progress edited by Joe Romm - http://thinkprogress.org/romm/issue/ (Joe Romm ranked as the leading Green site in 2009, by Technorati)

8. Roger Pielke, Jr. - Professor of Environmental Studies at the Center for Science and Technology Policy Research at the University of Colorado at Boulder - http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/


10. The role of social and decision sciences in communicating uncertain climate risks - http://www.nature.com/nclimate/journal/v1/n1/full/nclimate1080.html
