The Contrasts Between Traditional and Modern Diplomacy

Hikmatullah Mulki[1], Abdul Rahman Saeed[2], Mohammad Hasham Hasrat[3]

[1]Lecturer, Kandahar University
[2,3]Lecturer, Malalay Institute of Higher Education

Abstract

Throughout history, diplomacy has been served as a means of creating and managing connections between nations, addressing requirements, and resolving a range of political, economic, social, and cultural issues. It is an axiom that the organization and establishment of states in ancient times differed from the structure of contemporary states. Hence, the nature of their interactions, diplomatic strategies and the appointment of representatives and their roles in foreign countries are entirely distinct from those of the past time. In the past, state diplomacy was temporary, confidential, conducted between two parties, and solely aimed at resolving political issues. Following the Treaty of Westphalia and the subsequent formation of the nation-state system, diplomacy has evolved into its contemporary form. This transformation has been influenced by the advent of modern technology and the proliferation of information and communication tools, which have significantly impacted various facets of human life at both national and international levels. Consequently, there has been a fundamental shift in the nature, scope, participants, objectives, influential factors, and operational mechanisms of diplomacy and diplomatic interactions among nations. This study aims to examine the topic of political science, with a specific focus on international relations professionals. It seeks to explore the distinctions between historical and contemporary diplomacy and to provide a comprehensive and effective response to this inquiry.

Keywords: Contemporary diplomatic practices, historical diplomatic approaches, diplomatic goals, diplomatic tools, and diplomatic distinctions

Introduction

Throughout human history, diplomacy has been seen as a crucial art and science essential for individuals and societies. It involves the establishment of diplomatic missions in other countries, which are managed by individuals holding titles such as ambassador, representative, and diplomat. Based on this reasoning, diplomacy is regarded as one of the oldest human activities and interpersonal connections. Diplomatic and negotiation interactions between governmental and non-governmental entities at regional and international levels have been ongoing for a significant period of time, dating back to the formation of the nation-state system. As individuals grow older, their significance and impact grow as well. When humans left shepherd life and they began to adopt a tribal lifestyle, by meeting the needs and desires of people, circumstances were created that transitioned from a state of conflict to the establishment of new systems, eventually evolving into diplomacy. The neighboring tribes were compelled to develop various methods

to establish relationships with each other and address issues of conflict, peace, and cooperation within their communities (Roshendil, 1379).

Essentially, diplomacy is the method of managing relationships between nations and transforming hostile situations into friendly ones during disputes and conflicts. Nowadays, international affairs have a significant impact on countries, regions, and the world, necessitating cooperation and collaborative efforts among nations. In the past, this collaborative effort involved temporary representation of one country in another, which was a straightforward form of diplomacy. This later evolved into permanent representation during the second era of international relations, with the head of the country serving as the representative of the state. Now, the question arises: what are the distinctions between past and present diplomacy? It can be argued that international relations and diplomacy are inherently linked and are regarded as concepts that have evolved in form and approach over time. In rare instances, the previous state has remained unchanged. This study aims to distinguish the variations in diplomacy, implementation tools, objectives and advocates between the past and present states. It seeks to define the differences and similarities between previous and current diplomacy and highlight their points of divergence and convergence.

Methodology

As this topic pertains to a scientific and professional discipline with a well-defined historical framework, the approach to its documentation is bibliographic. This involves sourcing information from reputable national and international journals, as well as hard and digital publications in multiple languages, obtained through reliable internet platforms. The information is then gathered organized and analyzed through direct and indirect citations and quotations, in adherence to copyright and research ethics principles.

Introduction of Diplomacy

Diplomacy originates from the Greek Term Diploma or Diplon, which denoted a "written document" in Greek language. Presently, it is commonly employed in the context of educational institutions and centers. In the realm of politics, a diploma refers to an official document signed and sealed by high-ranking officials, conferring special titles and privileges upon the recipient (Basirat, 1379). However, diplomacy itself refers to the formal relations between nations, often involving ceremonial protocols. Different definitions of the term have been provided, all with almost the same meaning. In a unique way, diplomacy is viewed as a tool of state politics in dealing with other state and international actors (Ulfat,1394). They generally encompass the process of resolving foreign policy-related issues with other states, international governmental and non-governmental organizations, and individuals. Diplomacy is also characterized by the continuous exchange of information between states, nations, groups, and individuals to advance national interests (J.M., 2007).

Distinguishing Points between Traditional and contemporary diplomatic practices

The traditional diplomacy, which was carried out discreetly, temporarily and between two parties, has its origins in the relationships among the renowned Italian city-states, which were relatively inward-looking. However, following the conclusion of the 30 years of religious conflicts in Europe, as evidenced by the Peace of Westphalia, a shift towards diplomatic discourse and international engagement occurred. The concept of diplomacy has evolved significantly due to major revolutions and changes in state relations. The distinctions between past and present diplomacy can be summarized as follows:

Frist: Adjectives:

In the past, diplomacy was primarily used to address political issues. It was also employed when a country recognized the military superiority of the opposing side compared to its own, but could leverage its own strength to its advantage by using diplomacy to warn the opposing side to accept its goals and demands. However, in the absence of knowledge regarding the capabilities and influence of the opposing side, the primary objective of diplomacy was to satisfy curiosity and gather information. The primary objective of contemporary diplomacy is to safeguard the paramount interests of the nation and uphold the rights of its citizens when implementing national policies in the global arena (Qawam, 1384).

Second: Aspects

In the past, diplomacy had two parties, but contemporary diplomacy encompasses multiple aspects, including multilateral agreements among several nations to pursue shared political and economic objectives, as well as the establishment of international organizations through agreements. Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, countries engaged in peace conferences to form multilateral agreements, leading to the creation and transformation of global, regional, and continental organizations such as the Vienna Conference, the League of Nations, the United Nations, and the European Union (Moshirzad et al., 1390). Mark Zacher, a Canadian political science scholar, has referred to the "Westphalia temple" as the traditional framework for international politics, where only countries were considered as key players in international relations, as being in decline. The diplomatic landscape has evolved significantly. In the past, international relations were primarily defined by interactions between states. However, today, other entities such as international governmental and non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations, and humanitarian institutions have gained influence and are actively shaping international relations. These diverse actors are working to maintain the existing interconnectedness among nations (Mashirzad et al., 1390).

In terms of both horizontal and vertical dimensions, there is a contrast between past and present diplomacy. Previously, diplomacy focused solely on political and military matters between states horizontally, but contemporary diplomacy encompasses a broader range of issues such as water and climate changes, infectious diseases, poverty, development, human rights, trade, security, and international organizations. In essence, through the collaborative efforts of states, conferences, and ultimately multilateral agreements, diplomacy now addresses virtually every issue between states. If we examine the recent diplomatic efforts between nations within the context of either bilateral or international organizations, we can see that as their relationships grow, these countries will experience increasing mutual advantages across various domains.

Third: Leading Rules and Regulations

In previous times, diplomatic relations were primarily governed by informal or implicit protocols and guidelines for addressing inter-country conflicts and concerns. The enforcement of traditional norms against a dominant party can result in significant challenges, potentially escalating to armed conflict. As the eighteenth century came to an end, the exchange of ambassadors and the hierarchical relationships between states led to significant tensions. As the number of countries grew and international relations evolved, the sending of ambassadors to other countries and the management of diplomatic affairs became more formalized. Despite the formal and unclear nature of diplomatic rules at the time, governments were

urged to resolve diplomatic issues based on established state regulations, rather than relying solely on their own compliance and commitment.

In this context, a book written in German by political scholars like J.G. Bluntchli in 1867 listed 224 articles for organizing diplomatic matters. Similarly, P. Fiore, a professor at the University of Naples, published a book in Italian in 1889 titled "International Written Laws and the Guarantee of their Legal Execution," which included 1340 articles for regulating diplomatic affairs (Zulain, 1389). This is why countries were biding their time to assert themselves on the global stage. When they felt strong enough, they would launch attacks on other nations. This led to the occurrence of two global conflicts. However, following the first World War, the League of Nations, an international organization with a focus on Europe, was established. This entity was established as a collaborative partner to the International Court of Justice, rather than in isolation. In traditional diplomatic practices, nations were not constrained by specific regulations, but rather adhered to the principles established within their alliances, with a focus on maintaining a balance of power (Kourti, 2020).

In the first half of the 20th century, following the occurrence of two world wars, international organizations were established to promote organizational diplomacy. On the 11th of a certain month, 81 countries, along with permanent or affiliated organizations of the United Nations, convened at the New Palace of Neuhofburg in Vienna, Austria. They established the Convention on Diplomatic Rights, consisting of 53 articles, which became obligatory upon signing on April 18, 1961. On April 24, 1963, the second phase involved the signing and implementation of the Convention on Consular Rights, which consisted of 79 articles and two annexes. The third phase, in 1975, saw the signing and enforcement of the convention on the relations between countries and international organizations, as well as their representation on a global scale.

Finally, in the first half of the 20th century, after the outbreak of two world wars, international organizations were created based on the use of organizational diplomacy by countries. On March 2, 1961, 1339 A.H., coinciding with the 11th day of the month of Kab, the Convention on Diplomatic Rights was established in 53 articles at the Homburg Palace in Vienna, Austria. It included 81 countries as well as independent or affiliated organizations of the United Nations. It became mandatory after being signed by the countries on April 18, 1961 (Basirat, 1379). In the next stage, on April 24, 1963, the Convention on Consular Rights was signed by the countries with 79 articles and two annexes and became enforceable. In the third step, the 1969 Convention on Special Diplomatic Missions was drafted and ratified in 55 articles and an appendix. Ultimately, in 1975, the convention on the relations of countries and their representation in international organizations, including the world, was signed and became enforceable (Zulain, 1389).

Fourth: In accordance with both legal and ethical standards.

The traditional diplomacy included military and warlike aspects, often overlooking legal and moral considerations by major powers. During that period, power was the dominant force, with major powers controlling most regions of the world. As a result, there was a lack of distinct diplomatic strategy and the international system was characterized by anarchy and a disregard for the existence of others. The eleventh king in the line of French monarchs held the belief that using any means of diplomacy is acceptable in order to achieve the state's goals. The Italian politician "Machiavelli" argued that national interest should take precedence over moral considerations. He believed that a successful politician is one who is not constrained by morals(Bijini,1384). However, contemporary diplomacy has shifted from the principle of war to recognizing the existence of others and promoting a "live and let other live" approach. In essence,

morality holds a significant role in modern diplomacy, with the majority of countries striving to base their diplomatic efforts on moral principles. They seek to justify their actions to the global community's prevailing thoughts and values at the outset of each endeavor. The current diplomatic approach is based on a legal framework that considers not only military strength, but also the perspectives of nations and the principle of equal sovereignty. A significant development in modern diplomacy is the establishment of international organizations, where states, regardless of their size or strength, adhere to the principle of equal sovereignty under a unified authority.

Fifth: Variations in language and culture

In traditional diplomacy, certain formalities and rituals were deemed obligatory and enforced, including the attendance of diplomats at national ceremonies of the host country, residence at the court of the host country's leader, and the deferential treatment of government officials by subordinate diplomats. Diplomatic appointments, meetings, and relations were conducted with specific protocols, attire, and language, often employing formal and complex literary and serious vocabulary, with French being the predominant language in this field. However, contemporary diplomacy has undergone significant transformation, with a departure from these traditional practices. Diplomats are not required to attend all of the host state's national ceremonies, but their participation in select events demonstrates the goodwill and cooperation between the visiting and host states (Bijni, 1384). The use of French language terms and words is not mandatory, but rather a choice. In today's international environment, English has become the dominant language, especially in the diplomatic field. In addition to English proficiency, diplomats are expected to possess a wide range of skills including international law and politics, communicating, interviewing, public speaking and negotiation.

Sixth: Transformation in the characteristics and instruments of diplomatic practice

In traditional diplomacy, tactics such as power, threats, violence, warnings, and military force were commonly used. Communication relied solely on real people. However, in modern era hard power is employed instead of force and threats. Through the use of soft and strategic influence, each participant in global affairs achieve its goals by utilizing various channels of communication beyond direct human interaction. These channels include economic influence, trade agreements, international governmental and non-governmental organizations and modern technologies such as the Internet and satellites. This shift in diplomacy has expanded the concept from traditional interaction between states to relations between states, international organizations, civil institutions and individuals, which is referred to as multilateral diplomacy. In contemporary discourse, Hegel, a prominent political theorist, claimed that diplomacy and the improvement of diplomatic relations between nations did not indicate a country's weakness, but rather served as a means to promote national interests, resolve international conflicts, and alleviate pressure. This perspective emphasizes the importance of diplomacy as an effective tool to achieve these goals (H Nakamua and Epstein, 2007). John Rugi, an expert in international relations, believes that we are not just observing a shift in politics, but also a profound transformation in the approach and practice of political application within the political sphere (Ganji Dost, ۱۳۸۷).

In the present time, each nation is equipped with the necessary protocols and guidelines concerning its borders with neighboring countries, as well as interactions with governmental and non-governmental organizations. This is facilitated by the use of modern information and communication technologies,

including computers, internet, satellite and optical fiber networks, mobile phones, television, cable, and various social media platforms enabled by software (Waheedi, 1368).

Findings:

Throughout the course of human history, diplomacy has served as a method for resolving conflicts and facilitating communication between various states, groups, and nations. This investigation has identified specific instances that illustrate the evolution of diplomatic concepts from earlier times to the present.

1. In the realm of diplomacy, a significant development occurred in the 15th century as European countries established a new level of order and cooperation in their international relations, particularly among states. This has since evolved into a global phenomenon.

2. Initially, there was a creation of a lasting diplomatic presence in the Italian city-states. Prior to this, diplomats were viewed as spies and were required to be closely monitored by the host state. They were provided with a designated location.

3. Throughout the history of diplomacy, diplomats possessed a greater range of authorities than they have in the present time.

4. Before the emergence of Islam, politicians discussed the importance of diplomatic security and benefits, but in practice, states relied on mutual interaction. However, after the establishment of the Islamic government in Madinah under the leadership of Prophet Hazrat Muhammad PBUH, diplomatic immunity and privileges were put into effect.

Discussion

In traditional diplomacy, negotiations were employed when there was a potential equilibrium between the parties or in modern terms, a balance of power. However, in contemporary diplomacy, international players demonstrate their adherence to global principles and laws alongside national regulations. This shift transforms the environment from an anarchic one to a relatively hierarchical setting.

In the field of international relations, in the past, diplomatic relations were limited to the state level, leading to the perception that only states were the key players in international relations. However, contemporary diplomacy involves a wide range of international actors, including international organizations, multinational companies, and civil institutions. This shift reflects the evolving nature of diplomacy from being state-centric to encompassing a broader spectrum of international actors. As states become members of these organizations and accept their obligations, they relinquish some sovereign powers to these organizations both domestically and internationally. As a result, organizational diplomacy has emerged as a new dimension of diplomacy within the international system.

In the early days of diplomatic relations, the diplomats or foreign policy envoys were seen as the personal representatives of the state's ruler, such as the emperor, king or other title. They were not representing the state itself, but rather the ruler and were typically his close and trusted associates. Chosen from among the people, the diplomat would have the authority to make decisions based on prior consultation due to the limited means of communication with the head of state. The diplomat represents the state, not the individual and with modern technology, contact with the head of state is simplified. Therefore, the diplomat is obligated to seek advice and guidance before making any decisions.

In the past, states relied on force, threats and military might to accomplish their objectives. There were no moral standards or special principles governing international relations, only the self-serving principles of

the powerful. However, in today's diplomacy, the majority of countries around the world are obligated to adhere to and formally endorse international conventions.

Conclusion:

In this research paper, we conclude that diplomacy has historically been utilized to establish relations between international players and to address issues that arise in those relations. We also explore various diplomatic situations in both historical and contemporary contexts. It is considered an art form. According to Islamic scholars, the angel Gabriel (peace be upon him) conveyed the revelation between Allah and the Prophets. However, among humans, diplomacy is viewed as a tool for national politics in the international arena. The evolution of relationships among actors and their communication technology, along with the globalization of the economy and trade, have led to significant changes and diverse situations in diplomacy, both in its

References

1. Basirat, A. N. (2000). Diplomatic History . Jalalabad : Salam Publishing Society .
2. Bijni, M. (2005). Diplomacy in Ghazar Zaman. *Fazlnameh Political and Economic*(221,22), 118-129. Retrieved from http:/www.noormags.ir/view/fa/articlepage/96235
3. Copeland, D. (2009). *Guerilla Diplomacy: Rethinking International Relations.* United States: Lynne Renner.
4. Dost, M. G. (2000). Development in Diplomacy in the age of Information. *Quarterly Politics, Faculty of law and Political Science Journal*(1), 185-212. Retrieved from http://www.sid.ir/fa/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id-77797
5. Epstein, K. H. (2007). Diplomacy for the 21st Century. *Transformational Diplomacy*, 1. Retrieved from http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/index.html
6. Hall, I. (2010). The Transformation of Diplomacy: Mysteries, Insurgencies and Public Relations. *International Affiars (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944), 86*(1), 256-274.
7. Ibrahimi, H. M. (2011). Evolution of concepts in International Relations . Tehran : Tehran Strategic Reserach Institute .
8. Kourti, A. (2020). The long march to Peace: The Evolution from "Old Diplomacy" to "New Diplomacy" . *E-International Relations* , 30.
9. Qawam, S. A. (2005). From Diplomacy Modern to Diplomacy Media. *Fazlnameh Law and Law, 7*(17), 7-19. Retrieved from htpp://enasani.ir/fa/article/4816/-
10. Roshandil, J. (2000). National Security and the International System. Kabul Peace Publishing Society.
11. Ulfat, A. (2011). Foundamantals of Diplomacy . Kabu: Future Publishing Society .
12. Waheedi, M. A.-R. (2006). Changing the field of International Politics and the nature of doplomatic diplomacy. *Fzanameh Foreign Politics*(2), 360. Retrieved from ensani.ir/fa/article/journal-number/15693/82
13. Waller, M. (2007). *the Public Diplomacy Reader.* Washington: Institute of World Politics Press.
14. Zulien, P. (2010). Diplomatic Law . Tehran : Ministry of Foreign affiars .