


7TH SEMESTER BS POLITICAL SCIENCE
SUBJECT : DIPLOMACY
COURSE CODE: POL-405
COURSE INSTRUCTOR: S.M.SHAHARYAR
(Assoc.Prof)
DEPTT. OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
GOVT.GRADUATE COLLEGE ,TOWNSHIP
LAHORE.



- *PRESENTATION NO: 01..*
- DESCRIBING THE REALM OF DIPLOMACY AND INTRODUCING THE SUBJECT TO THE STUDENTS TO ENHANCE THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF THE TERM OF DIPLOMACY FROM VARIOUS PERSPECTIVES.
- INTRODUCING THE CLASS TO HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF DIPLOMACY AS A TOOL OF FOREIGN POLICY.

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

Some of the key questions that motivate scholars of diplomacy include the following:

1. What exactly is meant by the term 'diplomacy'?
2. What are its origins?
3. What practices distinguish it from other forms of international interaction?
4. Who or what can legitimately be called a diplomatic actor?
5. Is diplomacy only performed by sovereign states?
6. Can non-state actors – both good and bad – reasonably be called diplomatic actors?

DIPLMACY

INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITION

Stalin once observed:

"A diplomat's words must have no relation to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron." Another statesman has also observed, "When a diplomat says yes, he means perhaps; when he says perhaps, it means no; and when he says no, he is not a diplomat."

Such general characterizations of diplomacy have been quite popular but these do not reflect the true nature of diplomacy. No doubt, diplomacy at times attempts to cloak the real goals of national interests with several ideational principles or morality or rules of international behaviour, yet it cannot be described as the art of deceit and concealment. Diplomacy is, in fact, the art of negotiations and conduct of foreign relations. It is the key instrument for implementing the foreign policy of the nation.

INTRODUCTION

Diplomacy is the means by which States throughout the world conduct their affairs in ways to ensure peaceful relations. The main task of individual diplomatic services is to safeguard the interests of their respective countries abroad. This concerns as much the promotion of political, economic, cultural or scientific relations as it does international commitment to defend human rights or the peaceful settlement of disputes. Diplomacy takes place in both bilateral and multilateral contexts. Bilateral diplomacy is the term used for communication between two States, while multilateral diplomacy involves contacts between several States. Negotiation is one of the most important means of conducting diplomacy, and in many cases results in the conclusion of treaties between States and the codification of international law. The aim of such international treaties is primarily to strike a balance between State interests.

DEFINITION

The concept of diplomacy has been variously defined as follows:-

- Dr. Melville Herskovits says that Diplomacy is the peaceful resolution of disputes between autonomous groups.
- Harold Nicolson is of the view that diplomacy "is an organized pattern of communication and negotiation between States"
- Adam Watson says that "Diplomacy is the process and dialogue and negotiation by which states in a system conduct their relations and pursue their purposes by means short of war"
- Raymond Aaron defines Diplomacy as the "act of conducting relations with other states so as to further the national interests"
- The Encyclopaedia Britannica has defined Diplomacy as "the established method of international discourse or the art of managing international relations chiefly by negotiations.
- Random House Dictionary defines diplomacy as the conduct by government officials, of negotiations and other relations between nations, the art or science of conducting such relations

- Diplomacy is conventionally understood as the processes and institutions by which the interests and identities of sovereign states are represented to one another (Wiseman and Sharp, 2017: 297).
- Diplomatic Studies is generally distinguished from other subfields of International Relations (IR) by the strong distinction it draws between foreign policy – the formulation of a state's grand strategy or worldview – and diplomacy – the implementation of that grand strategy or worldview (Wiseman, 2015: 317)
- Diplomatic Studies is now, in the words of the editors of The SAGE Handbook of Diplomacy, a 'rich and expanding' academic subfield within the field of International Relations (Constantinou et al., 2016a: 1)
- As for research methods, Diplomatic Studies is typically less influenced by quantitative social science methods and more by analytical eclecticism, involving historical analysis, qualitative, interpretative, and interdisciplinary approaches. Whatever method is used, the serious study of diplomacy is warranted for the important reason that diplomacy shapes and even 'makes' world politics (Sending et al., 2015).
- Sir Ernest Satow asserts that "Diplomacy is the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of independent states, extending sometimes also to their relations with vassal states; or briefly still, the conduct of business between states by peaceful means."
Adams Watson says: " diplomatic dialogue is the instrument of international society; a civilized process based on awareness and respect for other people's point of view; and a civilizing one,

- Hans J. Morgenthau described Diplomacy as the promotion of national interest by peaceful means. Another definition of Diplomacy is that of Padelford and Lincoln. They discerned Diplomacy as the process of representation and negotiation by which states customarily deal with each other in times of peace. For them, Diplomacy is the mechanism for the promotion of national interest via negotiation and the conduct of relations with other states which is guided and conditioned by foreign policy.
- Harold Nicholson and Joseph Frankel defined Diplomacy as a basic means by which a nation seeks to secure the goals of its national interest and foreign policies. For them, goals are always anchored on the shoulder of Diplomacy. Such is because Diplomacy serves as a toolset for the operationalization of the objectives of a State.

Certainly what goes as diplomacy today is far more than what explained in the above definitions. It is more of use in war than in peace. In another light, K.M Paniker regarded Diplomacy as the art of forwarding one's interest in relations to other countries. It cannot be restricted as well to the confines of foreign ministries and missions or diplomatic service personnel, but many domestic political and nonpolitical actors, NGOs, almost all ministries, international organisations like UN or international financial institutions like IMF and World Bank, take part in diplomatic affairs nowadays.

CONCLUSION

In orchestrating and moderating the dialogue between states, diplomacy thus serves as a bulwark against international chaos; in this way it may be understood as a more fragile counterpart, operating within a system based upon states, to the domestic order or 'political system' of the state itself.

In short, we can say that diplomacy is the art and science of making possible the impossibilities, short of war or a step towards peace during the war which can lead to pursuing mutually beneficial relationships among various actors, especially through the career diplomats well trained and highly learned in the process of diplomatic relations. Diplomacy is the term given to the official channels of communication employed by the members of a system of states. In the modern world system these are to be found chiefly in a network of diplomats and consuls who enjoy the protection of special legal rules and are permanently resident abroad, some at the seats of international organizations.

NATURE OF DIPLOMACY

This encompasses the characteristics, form of practice and the dimension that shapes Diplomacy as a concept. The nature of Diplomacy can be categorised as follows:

- **Diplomacy is amoral:** This entails that it maintains a neutral position when it comes to morality, it just exists as a vehicle for the actualisation of the foreign policy of a state as shaped by the need of their national interest. To achieve its objective it can make use of deceit, propaganda or immoral tact's.
- **It is a means of international relations:** Here it utilizes techniques and procedure for the conduct of affairs amongst States which transforms Diplomacy into machinery for actions.
- **The structural nature of Diplomacy:** this exemplifies Diplomacy acting through settled structure and procedures such as networks of embassies, foreign office, legation, consulate and special mission, working by definition and settled methods. These structures could be used in bilateral or multilateral forms to handle issues.
- **Equality of States :** The main challenge of diplomacy is how to manage international relations or how to promote dialogue between states while at the same time ensuring the independence of states is preserved. Diplomacy is essentially concerns with negotiation between political entities which acknowledge each other independence. The equality of states, therefore, is a fundamental component of the diplomatic dialogue.
- **The Goal of Peace :** Diplomacy's primary purpose is to promote the search for international understanding, goodwill and peace. The clash of conflicting interests between states is to be managed without causing bitterness or resentment and without recourse to war. Truly has it been said that diplomacy is an alternative to war to achieve a nation's goals.
- **Bilateral as well as Multilateral in Form:** Diplomacy is commonly bilateral in character. However as a result of the growing importance of international conferences, international organisations, regional negotiations, it has now also developed a plural character. It is concerned with all issues and problems among nations.

- **Diplomacy handles all types of Matters:** Diplomacy may embrace a multitude of interests—from the simplest issues to vital issues to that of war and peace.
- **Breakdown of Diplomacy always leads to Crisis:** When diplomacy breaks down, the danger of war, or at least of a major crisis develops.
- **Diplomacy operates both in times of Peace as well as War:** Some writers hold that diplomacy operates only in times of peace and when war breaks out diplomacy comes to an end. However, this is not a correct view. Diplomacy continues to operate even when war breaks out. Of course, during war its nature undergoes a change; from peace diplomacy it takes the form of war diplomacy.
- **Diplomacy works in an environment characterised both by Conflict and Cooperation:** Diplomacy works in a situation involving both cooperation and conflict. A certain degree of cooperation among nations is essential for the working of diplomacy because in its absence, diplomatic relations cannot be maintained. Similarly when there is no conflict diplomacy becomes superfluous because there is no need for negotiations. Thus existence of cooperation as well as conflict is essential for the working of diplomacy.
- **Diplomacy always works for securing national interests of the nation it represents:** The purpose of diplomacy is to secure the goals of national interest as defined and specified by the foreign policy of the nation. Diplomacy always works for the nation it represents.
- **Diplomacy is backed by National Power.** Diplomacy is backed by national power: A strong diplomacy means a diplomacy backed by a strong national power. Diplomacy uses persuasion and influence as the means for exercising power in international relations. It cannot use force and violence. However, it can issue warnings, give ultimatums, promise rewards and threaten punishment, but beyond this it cannot directly exercise force. "Diplomacy is the promotion of national interest by peaceful means."
- **Test of Success of Diplomacy:** Success in Diplomacy is measured in terms of the amount of success achieved towards the fulfillment of the goals of national interest in international relations.

All these characteristics highlight the nature of Diplomacy. One can describe Diplomacy as an instrument of national interest and a tool of foreign policy.

DIPLOMATIC THEORY

Diplomatic theory is reflective in character, permanently indebted to historical reasoning, and unfailingly ethical in inspiration. The moral element is perhaps nowhere better illustrated than by the question: must diplomats always keep their promises to foreign governments? However, even the claim of Martin Wright that diplomacy is 'the master-institution of international relations' is an argument not solely or even chiefly about its varying impact on everyday international events, but about its value and the consequent wisdom of upholding it.

Diplomatic theory appeared at the same time as diplomacy began to assume its distinctively modern form in the late fifteenth century, though it is not surprising that at this stage it was weak and stunted in growth. In the course of analysing many treatises on the ambassador produced in the period from the late fifteenth until the early sixteenth century, Behrens observed repeated emphasis on the following lines of questioning: What is an ambassador? What class of person and manner of entourage should be sent on different kinds of mission to princes of varying standing? Is a hierarchy of official classes of diplomat desirable and, if so, what form should it take? On what grounds are the privileges and immunities of diplomats justified? For what purposes do embassies exist? By what principles should an ambassador regulate his conduct; in particular, must he always be honest? - Above all, were the newly emerging resident embassies a good thing or not?

Though the answers to these questions were seldom extensively considered and often lacking cogency, we can at least see that the questions themselves were good ones. Most have remained points of departure for diplomatic theory until the present time. In those days most of the writing on diplomacy was the work of either diplomats such as Ermolao Barbaro, jurists like Alberico Gentili, or some typified by Grotius who were both. As a result, and also in obedience to the fashionable 'mirror of princes' tradition, until the late seventeenth century discussion of diplomacy tended to revolve around 'the perfect ambassador' and his complex legal standing at a foreign court. In the aftermath of the Congress of Münster and Osnabrück however, when it became clear that the rulers of Europe had a common interest in regulating their frequently bellicose 'foreign' relations, diplomatic theory acquired a more explicit political

This occurred when attention came to centre on the part played by the combined and continuous activities of numerous embassies representing the constituent parts of the loose association of 'Europe'. This is particularly evident in Wicquefort's encyclopaedic analysis, which adds to the usual account of the 'law of nations' relating to diplomatic immunity a refreshing emphasis on the regime of work daily engaged in by ambassadors and other envoys. The new angle of interest was however given most trenchant expression in the more succinct and accessible treatment provided by CallieÁres. It is CallieÁres, writing at the time of the Congress of Ryswick (1697), who first and most tellingly explains diplomacy by reference to the business of a multiplicity of states, and who is persuaded of its indispensable usefulness, amounting to necessity to the European states-system.

It remains to ponder for a moment longer the main themes emerging from this account of diplomatic theory which have persisted until the present day. Perhaps the most dominant one centres on the recognition that even the most powerful states are unable to achieve or maintain their ends solely or securely by force. As a result, diplomacy is seen as a valuable 'means' or 'instrument' of foreign policy. Indeed, it is frequently noted that a diplomatic service that is well resourced and above all well staffed can give a state a significant increment of power and influence. Machiavelli, though acutely aware that 'pure diplomacy' was not enough, expresses this point of view in his admiration for the money spent on express messengers by the Duke Valentino. Richelieu considered diplomacy of such vital importance in furthering the interests of France that he thought it should be 'continuous'. Kissinger was similarly so persuaded of the productiveness of diplomacy that although National Security Advisor and then Secretary of State as well, he never hesitated to keep to himself the kernel and detail of important negotiations.

Once accepted, the claim that well conducted diplomacy confers important advantages leads on to related themes. Among these is the argument that finds in diplomacy no 'true end or purpose' such as the pursuit of peace, though this had been an important element in mediaeval thought. The embodiment of an entirely neutral instrument, diplomats must support the foreign policy of their state no matter what its content. If an envoy is instructed to negotiate an aggressive alliance, so be it. A second theme is found in the claim that negotiation should wait for 'the right season', a precept suggested by Guicciardini almost five centuries before it was rediscovered and glossed by peace research institutes in Scandinavia and elsewhere. Like others, he also stressed the need to conduct negotiations in secrecy, on pain of forfeiting the trust and ability to compromise without which they are stifled.

Thirdly, diplomats need not keep their promises to foreign governments if this does not serve the interests of their own state.

However, as Machiavelli made shockingly plain, the ability to break one's word goes hand in glove with the advantages of preserving a reputation for trustworthiness.

Fourthly, and with the caveat that Grotius himself stood out against this view, opinion came to accept the merits of continuous diplomacy; of permanent rather than sporadic negotiations conducted with wartime enemies as well as peacetime friends.

And lastly, while lobbying, gleaning information and negotiating agreements are staple functions of the ambassador, his representational tasks are of more than trivial ceremonial importance. To re-present a state in the company of one's host and protector is to give dignified expression to the independence claimed by those in whose sovereign name he acts. Alongside the foregoing, it is necessary to keep in mind that continuing strain of thought which takes for granted the necessity for diplomacy and dwells instead on the requirements of diplomacy. Among those who served in what Nicolson called the 'French system' of diplomacy, one can detect a lingering fascination with the attributes of the 'ideal diplomatist'. Added to this, and following in the wake of CallieÁres, is a burgeoning interest in the need for diplomacy to be better organized and made more professional. This is accompanied by entrenchment of the view (already noticeable in Grotius) that the privileges and immunities which international law ascribes to its practitioners are justified by the impossibility of conducting effective diplomacy without their safeguard. There is lastly a need at least to acknowledge the important theme in diplomatic theory which treats diplomacy as an independent or at least distinctive and at times additionally separate influence in foreign affairs. A corollary of the theme of professionalization, this is the claim detectable in CallieÁres, through Satow to Nicolson, though somewhat lost sight of in Kissinger, that diplomacy is not simply lobbying, bargaining and eavesdropping. Instead, it is accomplishing these tasks in such a way that the moderating and thereby civilizing effect of diplomacy on the general conduct of states is maximized. Honest dealing must therefore be maintained even though this may bring no immediate or tangible gains. The maintenance of peace though not at any price must be a high priority. Protocol must be studied and carefully followed, not merely to prevent arguments over status and correct procedure from distracting attention from more serious matters, but so that it can help cushion and mollify relations between states. In short, this is the claim that diplomacy is a civilizing as well as a civilized activity.

OBJECTIVES OF DIPLOMACY

The objectives of Diplomacy can be grouped under four headings they are:

- A. The General Objective of Diplomacy
- B. The Specific Objective of Diplomacy
- C. The Political Objective of Diplomacy
- D. The Non-Political Objective of Diplomacy

Firstly, Diplomacy General Objective is peace and co-operation between States, which can be used in times of war or conflict. In pursuing the General Objective of Diplomacy, a State seeks to maintain friendly relations with others and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Likewise, its Specific Objective applies to the individual state actors so concerned. Hence, the specific objective of Diplomacy is that of national interest. And so in pursuit of its specific objectives, state regard modern Diplomacy as a tool to further their national interest by what Joseph Frankel referred to as soft power (non-military means) and/or hard power (military means).

Diplomacy has Political Objective as well . The Political Objective of Diplomacy is to secure the national interest of a state as defined in its foreign policy (e.g. increase the influence of a state by the use of persuasion, the promise of rewards etc.) to promote friendship and co-operation as well as to justify states actions.

Another Objective of Diplomacy is that of the Non-Political Objective. Here, Diplomacy seeks interdependence for state, as a function of dependences on others for economic, cultural and commercial links by the use of peaceful and persuasive means to promote the interest of the nation.

METHODS FOR SECURING THE OBJECTIVES OF DIPLOMACY

In order to secure the objectives of Diplomacy, nations can make use of variance of methods such as persuasion, which entails the use of logical reasoning to convince others. Another is a concession, which could be taken to mean a reward for good behaviour or to agree to meet a party demands midway. Yet another is the threat of/or the use of force is also another means of achieving the objectives of Diplomacy, which involves the use of ultimatums, boycotts, protest, walk-out and others. And another, it the use of non-violent punishment that revokes a promised reward and the use of pressure that connects propaganda and cultural links to exploit

MODALITIES OF DIPLOMACY

1. The Centrality of Communication and Dialogue

The approach of diplomacy is essentially give-and-take. Diplomacy calls for compromise, tolerance cooperation, accommodation and adjustment. Ideology contradicts the craft of diplomacy because it assumes an exclusive, rigid and defiant posture.

2. Immunities and Privileges

A key assumption of diplomacy is the acceptance of certain privileges and immunities. The belief is widespread even in the most primitive of societies is that there has to be immunities of envoys if they are to come and go and if the dialogue is to glow freely and safely. It is not surprising that diplomatic immunities and privileges were codified by the United Nations under the name of the Vienna Convention in 1961.

Means of Diplomacy:

For securing its objectives, Diplomacy depends upon three major means: persuasion, compromise and threat of use of force. Diplomacy has to depend upon several tactics or techniques. The chances of the success of diplomacy are directly related to the ability of using appropriate means through appropriate tactics. In the main diplomacy uses six techniques. A selection of a method or means is done on the basis of the time and circumstances of the situation. Any wrong decision in this respect can lead to a failure:

Six Main Devices of Diplomacy:

- (i) **Persuasion:** Through logical reasoning, Diplomacy seeks to convince others of the justification of the goals which it is trying to uphold or promote.
- (ii) **Rewards:** Diplomacy can offer rewards for securing acceptance of desired view of a particular international dispute or issue or problem.

(iii) **Promise of Reward and Concessions:** Diplomacy can promise matching rewards and concessions for securing a particular change or maintaining a particular view in the policies of other nations.

(iv) **Threat of use of Force:** Diplomacy cannot use force or violence in promoting the national interest. However, it can use threat of use of force—ultimatums, symbolic boycotts, protest walkouts or even threat of war etc., for securing its objectives.

(v) **Non-violent Punishment:** By depriving a promised reward or concession, Diplomacy can inflict non-violent punishment on other nations.

(vi) **Use of Pressure:** By using pressure tactics Diplomacy can force other nations to accept the desired view or policy or decision or goals that it represents. Besides these, Diplomacy also uses propaganda, cultural links, exploitation of situations, creation of particular scenes and situations, rigidity or flexibility in negotiations etc. Kautilya, in his Arthashastra, suggests "Sam, Dam, Danda Bheda and Niti" as the tactics of Diplomacy.

DEVELOPMENT OF DIPLOMACY AND ITS METHODS OR TECHNIQUES

The present kind of diplomatic network first came into being in the Italian peninsula in the second half of the fifteenth century and reached its full expression in Europe in the two and a half centuries that followed the Congress of Münster and Osnabrück (1644±8). From the end of the First World War until well after the end of the Second, the diplomacy of this system was subjected to unprecedented criticism: it was said to be the handmaiden of war, or imperialism or both. Nevertheless, it withstood its detractors and, at the height of the Cold War, was strengthened by the successful codification of the customary international law governing its procedures.

Historically, it meant the conduct of official relations between sovereign states usually bilaterally. Other definitions include the following: "Diplomacy is the mechanism through which international relations are conducted. The principal function of diplomacy is to moderate and manage the clash of conflicting interests as efficiently as possible". Another clarification says that "it is a function of the diplomatic dialogue to mitigate and civilize the differences between states". Diplomacy has existed since the time when States, empires or other centres of power dealt with each other on an official basis. Numerous diplomatic archives have been found in Egypt dating back to the 3th century BC. Permanent diplomatic missions, that is, representations set up by one country in the territory of another, date back to the Renaissance in the 15th century. Switzerland set up its first permanent legations in its neighbouring countries around 1500. At the time, international relations were mostly conducted through honorary consuls, who carried out these functions in parallel with their professional activities and in a voluntary capacity. The modern Swiss Confederation, which was founded in 1291, first began to build up a network of professional diplomatic missions and consular posts towards the end of the 19th century. The detailed developmental journey is as follows.

EVOLUTION

The study of the evolution of diplomatic practice seeks to explore the manner in which the institutions, principles and practices of diplomacy started, grew and developed into the world wide system that we know today. The basic purpose is to outline the earliest beginnings in the conduct and regulation of inter-state relations, to identify the elements of change and continuity throughout the centuries and to discern and distil the essential traditions that helped to shape the form and character of diplomacy which constitutes the prevailing universal system codified in 1961 under the name of the Vienna Convention.

GREEK ORIGINS

The Greek Geo-Political Situation

The Greeks have been described as the earliest of the European races to emerge into the full light of history. They peopled the western shores of the Mediterranean sea and were reputed to be a very intelligent race. It is remarkable that almost everything which is of great value in western civilization is traceable to the Greeks. For example, our science and philosophy, Medicine and Mathematics, Christian Theology and Diplomatic traditions. The Greeks geo-political situation represented a collectivity of small city states which were passionately attached to their political independence. They dealt with each other as equals. But they also recognized the value of co-existence and the need for extraterritorial communication and dialogue.

The strongest of the cities were Sparta and Athens. But for a substantial period, no single city was powerful enough to establish dominion over the other, nor were they overwhelmed from outside. Indeed, although the Greek city states enjoyed economic, cultural and linguistic ties, they were not disposed to forging a common political framework uniting all the Greek people into one entity.

However, quite early in their history, the Greeks developed institutions and practices which served as integrative influences. For example, the Olympic Games which began in the 776BC encouraged a level of interaction between the various states. Another form of interaction also prevailed in the 6th century through the meetings of the Greeks at religious festivals. The Amphictyony – a confederation of states established round a religious centre was an institution designed to maintain the purity of the Greek religion. The confederation gave rise to inter-state assemblies and permanent-secretariat.

METHODS OF DIPLOMACY OF THE GREEKS

(a) Envoys

The city-states adopted the practice of choosing as their always, prominent persons who were at least 50 years old and were the best speakers or finest orators. They possessed the diplomatic skill of persuasion. Their task was to sway foreign assemblies with magnificent speeches.

(b) Diplomatic Immunity

The Greeks defined the limits of immunities for diplomats.

(c) Concept of Universal Representation

In the Greek international system, recognition was given to the independence and the equality of states and the need for each state to have a voice. This became a key principle of the United Nations (Universal Rep.)

(d) Introduction of Arbitration and Conciliation

The interjection of third parties into the resolution of conflicts through the procedures of arbitration and conciliation was one of the important contributions of the Greeks to the history of diplomatic practice.

(e) The idea of permanent representation

The Greeks introduced a kind of consular representation called the PROXENOS. They were citizens of the city in which they resided not of the city state they employed them.

BYZANTINE PERIOD

The external problems faced by the rulers of Byzantium arise out of the threat of invasion from vertically all quarters – from the West and from Central Asia”. H.A.L.

Fisher in his book a history of Europe commented as follows “Byzantium experience great expiration feats of fortunes sometimes brilliantly victorious. At other times driven to the highest pit of abasement and misery and the East Roman empire defended for a 1000 years the cause of Greek Christianity in a world of enemies”. The East Roman empire or the Byzantium Empire lasted from 395 to 1453 A.D.

The situation faced by Byzantium inclined it to compensate for its relative weakness with shrewd diplomacy. In fact, it has been claimed that Byzantium initiated the traditions of using a skillful and subtle diplomacy to compensate in part for a lack of real power. It used various methods, including flattery by means of the confinement of title, bribery; dynastic marriages divide and rule policy. It is not surprising that the gathering of information or collection of intelligence about the internal politics and external relationships of neighbouring societies became crucial. Byzantium is said to have had the first professional diplomat. At the time Byzantium crumbled in the 15th century A.D., its diplomatic system had been absorbed in the Italian peninsula particularly in the trading state of Venice. Venetian diplomacy was in turn copied by other Italian city states and later by France and Spain.

THE RENAISSANCE PERIOD 1400-1600

The renaissance has been defined as the great revival of Art, literature and learning in Europe in the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries based on classical sources; it began in Italy and spread gradually to other countries and marked the transition from the medieval world to the modern world.

It was a movement of rebirth and renewal associated in European history with the revival of antiquity of Greek and Roman learning and the reformation of religion which brought about a religious revolution.

ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS

- The revival of interest in Greek and Roman literature and civilization, which stimulated a desire to attain similar or better heights of achievements.
- In the area of religion, the questioning and rejection of old ideas and values. The new trend was towards criticism and re-interpretation.
- The impact brought by geographical discoveries which generated a factory of excitement and enthusiasm and also encouraged a spirit of adventure
- Development of a new sense of liberty which promoted the desire for knowledge and a willingness to experiment.
- The new attitude of inquiry made the public to be more interested in the mechanical and scientific workings of the world. There emerged a scientific revolution in Mathematics, Astronomy, Anatomy, etc.

The Italian renaissance is associated with the invention of permanent diplomatic institutions exemplified by the idea of resident Ambassadors. Ragner Numelim makes the point that the first permanent embassy is dated 1455 when a Venetian delegation was established been under the leadership of Duke Fracesco sforza.

Five years later in 1460 the Duke of Savoy sent to Rome an Arch Deacon as his permanent representative Spain and France copied the Venetian model. At the beginning of the 16th century regular and permanent diplomatic connections had developed among the countries of Western and Eastern Europe. What was responsible for the emergence of Resident Ambassadors?

The idea of Resident Envoys may have emerged in response to the peculiar challenges arising out of the Italian state system. Unlike the situation in the rest of Europe where nation states did not exist, Italy had or well defined sets of well-defined political entities on the western part of the peninsular.

An important political characteristic of Italian state at the time, was like of security and stability. The states quarreled and fought over territorial and dynastic interests and concluded alliances which shifted frequently. The Italians must have realized that continued strife and warfare among units of roughly equally capabilities and strength, would ultimately endanger the independence of each. Within this realization, they were able to reconcile their mutual hostilities and bring some stability to the system for a time. However, insecurity and instability continued and the hostile environment way have emphasized the need to collect reliable information about allies or enemies on a systematic basis and a systematic basis, hence the system of permanent diplomatic agent took root in Italy. Diplomatic reporting became one of the primary requirements for the formulation of successful external policies in 15th century Italy. The Ambassador abroad served as his government's main source of information about alliances, plans of aggression, secret agreements and domestic strife.

INNOVATIVE IDEAS IN DIPLOMACY – NICCOLO MACHIEVELLI

Another important landmark in diplomatic history which is associated with the renaissance is the emergency of new ideas in political and diplomatic thought. This event is associated with the Italian Diplomat and patriot – Niccolo Machiavelli. Machiavelli is associated with the expression "the end justifies the means".

Another expression of his is "everyone sees what you seem but few know who you are". Two things influenced Machiavelli in his political philosophy. Firstly, the Italy of his time was a sharply divided area. National unification was very much in the distant future. The area comprise a great number of small independent states which were the homes of fierce political rivalry and person ambition. The result was that the area became probated by external interference as more powerful neighbouring countries invaded parts of Italy from time to time. Machiavelli yearned for a saviour, a strong an astute Italian ruler who would save Italy from chaos.

Secondly, Machiavelli had his own experience of the shady character of Italian politics. No one bothered about moral values. This made Machiavelli to have a very low opinion of human nature.

Machiavelli wrote "the Prince" in 1513. In that book he depicted the kind of ruler best suited to liberate the soil of Italy from the presence of external invaders and to restore the glory of ancient Rome. The prince was presented as a shrewd actor in power politics, using without stipules and remorse such measure of force or fraud as to enable to him to secure and extend his conquests. In other words, the prince was concerned with practical politics with the way to acquire and hold power.

He said as follows "if a prince succeeds in establishing and maintaining his authority, the means will always be judged honourable and be approved by everyone". Machiavelli argued that if the ruler feels endangered by the popularity or unpopularity of a faithful adviser, he should sacrifice him ruthlessly in his own interest. What is important to a ruler is success and this he should achieve by any means.

With regard to his opinion of human nature he wrote as follows "it is to be asserted in general of men that they are ungrateful fickle, false, cowards, covetous and as long as you succeed, they are yours entirely. They will offer you their blood, property, life and children when the need is far distant. But when it approaches they turn against you".

Machiavelli's ideas exerted enormous and enduring influence in public life as an endorsement of false and fraud at the expense of morality and principle. It has been generally stated that the influence of the Prince gave Italian Diplomacy a reputation for deviousness, shiftiness, craftiness and ambivalence. These traditions, subsequently spread to England, France and other parts of Western Europe and have today become part of the tradition of diplomacy.

DIPLOMACY IN THE 17TH CENTURY – THE 30 YEARS (1618-1648)

The thirty years war arose out of a religious revolt in the Italy, Roman Empire which was another name for Germany. The Emperor of the Roman Empire was another name for Germany.

The Emperor of the Italy Roman Empire was a fanatical Catholic. He hated Protestants and was determined to uproot them from his dominion. The war soon lost its religious character and became a struggle between France and Germany for ascendancy in Europe. The Holy Roman Empire consisted of no less than 300 semi-autonomous states, free cities, prince – Bishopric, courtships – a strange conglomeration of differing authorities. Some writers have stated that the Holy Roman Empire or Germany was a weak federation of some 350 states; each empowered to pursue its foreign policy so long as it was not directed against the Emperor. The 30 years' war is important in diplomatic history for two main reasons.

Firstly, the four years of meetings and negotiations before final treaty of peace was signed, are generally regarded as the first great international congresses of modern history. The only sovereigns that were not represented at these meetings were the Tsar of Russia, the king of England the Sultan of Turkey. In the end the peace or treaty Westphalia was signed in 1648.

Secondly, the treaty of Westphalia which concluded the war was a milestone in the history of Diplomacy. The European Diplomats and Princes congregated in Westphalia, declared that henceforth the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire could no longer extend his dominions into the territories of princes sovereigns and that the alter were in no way obliged to respond to the directives of the Emperor.

In the words of K.J. Holsti, Westphalia symbolized the emergence of the modern European nation states system replacing the feudal political order. Another writer put the matter in this way "the treaty marked the end of the medieval conception of Europe and the emergence of the modern European nation state system". The rise of the national sovereign state is of great importance in the evolution of diplomacy in the world because the sovereign states are the principal parameters for the practice of diplomacy.

An important event during the period of the 30 years' war was the emergence of new ideas in the theory and practice of international relations. In 1625, the Dutch jurist Hugo Grotius published *De jure Belli ac pacis* (on the law of war and peace) which enunciated the concepts of state sovereignty and the equality of sovereign states both basic to the modern diplomatic system. Grotius explained that a resident diplomatic mission is a permanent, detached extra-territorial fragment of the represented sovereign's own territory flying his own flags and subject to his laws and not the laws of the host ruler. This is known as "the diplomatic concept of extra-territoriality".

CONCLUSION

In examining the different functions of diplomacy and how they are pursued, this book has traced in some detail what elsewhere I have called a 'counter-revolution in diplomatic practice' (Berridge 2005). As a broad trend, this rejuvenation of some of the key features of traditional diplomacy has gone unnoticed – partly because it has been masked by the attachment of new labels to old procedures, and partly because the novel has a greater fascination than the tried and tested. For those who care to look, however, the evidence of this counter-revolution is unmistakable.

There has emerged a quiet, almost resigned acceptance that resident embassies are not the anachronism they were thought to be in the 1960s and 1970s. Instead, they are still the state's first line of defence abroad; daily integrated more into policy-making by secure, instant communications; the key vehicle for routine negotiations; essential support to special envoys; and nearest thing to a mind-reader bolted onto the side of a host government. With the great increase in the flow of people across frontiers, the value of consular posts has also been rediscovered, and the old institution of the honorary consul, or consular agent, is flourishing once more. Propaganda – with which diplomats have often been uneasy, but with which they came to terms in the middle of the twentieth century – has been reinvented, and even returned to war-time proportions; for governments to describe this as 'public diplomacy' and allege that it is something new is understandable but should be seen as a rebranding exercise designed to pull the wool over our eyes. As the importance of coordinating foreign activities – among them, propaganda – has been reasserted, so, too, has the foreign ministry bounced back, or a functionally equivalent body placed over its shell. Summitry has also played its part in the counter-revolution, for its serial – as opposed to its *ad hoc* – form has become by far its most important; this, as with the new respect for the resident mission, signifies further recognition of the value of *continuous* contact between states – a cardinal principle of the old, French system of diplomacy.

Greater reliance on special envoys is a return to a medieval reflex. In multilateral diplomacy, the twentieth century's experiment with taking decisions by voting after a public debate has been liquidated by the rejuvenation of secret negotiation, among the many benefits of which is a working Great Power concert called the UN Security Council. As for the so-called 'new actors in diplomacy' – in particular, international NGOs – they are neither new nor engaged fully in diplomacy, a professional activity akin to the law or medicine: they are either free-booting amateurs, or para-diplomats with valuable but limited usefulness and no special immunities; in both cases, they long pre-date the appearance of the diplomatist. The main point here, though, is that the more experienced track two 'diplomats' now appreciate that to make a real contribution to diplomacy they must work with, and not parallel to, the professionals.

It is true that the counter-revolution in diplomatic practice I have described is, fortunately, only a partial one. For example, in the art of negotiation, there is now more manipulation of publicity to assist this all-important activity, more informality in the packaging of any agreements issuing from it, and – in following them up – far greater reliance on a variety of devices (some new) for their expert and systematic monitoring. As for change in the modes of diplomacy, consensus decision-making contains a few new tricks as well as old ones, and thereby represents a new version of secret negotiation in multilateral diplomacy; summitry has been extensively institutionalized; nationally staffed interests sections have become the norm; special envoys are now transported so frequently and quickly that this change in degree might be said to represent a change in kind; and telecommunication between governments at all levels has been truly revolutionized. In other words, planes carrying VIPs have not been grounded, the tablets of diplomats have not been dropped into bins, the secure telephones of other government departments and garrulous presidents have not been disconnected, and twittering – unlike birdsong in this respect, as also in its lack of harmony – has not got into the habit of diminishing as dawn passes into morning. In short, there is innovation in diplomacy; indeed, there has already been a great deal of it. But innovation is one thing; the complete transformation often claimed as a fact or heralded as imminent is quite another.

What we have witnessed in recent years is not the complete transformation of diplomacy but, rather, the more – occasionally less – intelligent application of new technology and new devices to support tried and tested methods, with the added advantage that this has helped to integrate the many poor and weak states into the world diplomatic system. What we have now is neither an old nor a new diplomacy but, instead, a blend of the two, which has produced a mature diplomacy. It is also one fortified by a respected legal regime.

This development is fortunate because, while power remains dispersed between states – while there remains, in other words, a states-system – international diplomacy, bilateral or multilateral, direct or indirect, at the summit or below, remains essential. If anything alone makes this glaringly obvious, it is the inventiveness that has gone into preserving resident diplomacy when diplomatic relations do not exist. Only professional diplomacy can continuously foster pursuit of interests held in common, and settle remaining arguments over interests that conflict. If violence breaks out, diplomacy remains essential if the worst excesses are to be limited and the ground prepared against the inevitable day of exhaustion and revised ambition.

