
New dynamics in foreign affairs: Failure of Diplomacy in 21st Century

L.G. Dilini Tharika Sirimardana

Abstract

The war is the ultimate failure of Diplomacy (Tony Benn, 1991). Good diplomacy can promote peace, trust among the parties, and ensure cooperation and good order within the neighborhood. The last resort in diplomacy is the use of force. Therefore, diplomacy traced between Idealism and Realism. The 9/11 attack coursed development of 21st century diplomacy, realistic in foreign affairs and despite fundamental changes to the Westphalian state system after 2001. The diplomatic relations might change situationally and word of diplomacy has become more diverse and complex. Although it has changed shape to accommodate new actors, concerns and technology. This paper discusses the problem of diplomatic representation with Realism perspective. The common norms of diplomatic discourse and the new elements are challenged by the grown diversity of international actors in 21st century diplomatic culture. The research objective is to evaluate the failure of diplomacy in contemporary diplomatic culture. The Research Onion Model used Interpretivism philosophy and deductive method used for approaching arguments. The research was conducted with two strategies, such as case study, archival research and mono-method qualitative data used for building arguments. The theory of Neo-Realism and concepts of diplomacy, track two diplomacy, globalization and Responsible to Protect (R2P) used for creating theoretical and conceptual framework. Evaluation of diplomacy was positioned in 21st century with more complex and dynamic. It consists Idealistic moralities and Realistic strategies, while deals with international disputes. Diplomats and diplomacy more associated with peace or negotiation than conflict. Final outcome of diplomacy will depend on diplomat's communication skill or conduct. Because diplomats are the foremost representation of the state who plays major role in promoting country relations, inviting investments and building country image. Even though they have to have good business knowledge for making connectivity between local and international markets. That is the main fact that, the State has more responsibility of appointing skillful diplomats rather than appointing a toady. The failure of diplomacy created negative impact to the state and its citizens. Therefore, efforts have to be diplomatically professionalized, when dealing with other countries either bilaterally or multilaterally.

Key Words: *Diplomacy, Track two Diplomacy, Neo-Realism, Globalization*

Introduction

“*War is the ultimate failure of Diplomacy*” –Tony Benn- (Benn, 1991, as cited in Broughton, 2014).

According to the statement, diplomacy traced between peace and war or between Idealism and Realism. Therefore, diplomacy created as mixer of these perspectives. Because, the situational diplomatic relation can be changed and world of diplomacy has become more diverse and complex through it. Encyclopedia Britannica define diplomacy as, “The art of conducting the intercourse of nations with each other” (Cooper, Heine and Thakur, 2013, p.3). Therefore, it’s a “political process” by “political entities” to establish and maintain official relations direct or indirect manner with one another. Hence, it became core function in political process with dynamic, adaptive and changing. It also can be identifying as an instrument of foreign policy. Because it can establish, maintain and development of peaceful contact between the government of different states. Therefore, diplomacy became into peaceful approach at the end of the war and war begins when that diplomacy process fails to achieve that effective diplomacy to prevent war.

According to Sun Tzu’s book (a military general, philosopher in China) name *The Art of War* highlighted “Diplomacy is the supreme art of war to subdue the enemy without fighting” (Tzu, 2002, as cited in Lamsal, 2014). This statement emphasized diplomacy is best alternative to war and it is decent behavior and morally justified approach.

The traditional perception of diplomacy is a negotiation, persuasion and dialogue among equal and sovereign states performed by a highly educated corps of Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) civil servants/diplomats (Kaufmann, 1988, as cited in Blaxekjaer, 2016, p.1). But it challenged in many ways. Currently non-state actors play significant role in diplomacy and they can influence states avoiding their sovereign.

The Diplomacy in the 21st century can emphasize under the four themes. Such as, individual level (diplomat), instrumental level (digitalized communication), institutional level (state to state and transnational) and global level (Stranzel, 2016, p.1). Strong personality continues to play critical role in the negotiation under the individual level. Institutional community mainly consider for increasing time burden on decision making, need to distil rapidly information responsibility and integration of social media into diplomatic work (Stranzel, 2016, p.1). The Institutional level highlighted traditional form of conference diplomacy, more international and supranational organization have been created and interaction among their member states. Global level considered hard or soft or symbolic power. Other than that expect to achieve long term goals and non-Western diplomacy.

Evaluation of Diplomacy

Diplomacy has long history. The Greek word of “a diploma” means an official document or state papers, who organizes these documents was recognized as diplomats. These diplomats were officials dealing with international relations (Cooper, Heine and Thakur, 2013, p.3). Diplomacy can divided two sides as old diplomacy and new diplomacy. It comes as traditional, classical and modern period of diplomacy (Cooper, Heine and Thakur, 2013, p.5). Diplomacy created with long history of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Hittite, Prussia, Greece, Rome, India and China and in traditional era came with Greece as above mention “Diploma” papers. According Gottfried Leibniz (1693) in *Codex Juris Gentium* “Diplomaticus” showed how the word “Diplomatic” had become linked with international relations (Leibniz, 1693, as cited in Nijman, 2005, p.2). In 1725 Baran Jean De Dumont wrote a book and it introduced the concept of a diplomatic “crops” (Freeman, 2019). In these traditional era it created with represent of king or ruler. In the classical era Europe is Centre of international politics. Modern diplomacy origin states of Northern Italy 17 and 18 centuries. It became more complex with multilateral actors.

Especially in old (traditional) diplomacy created state-state relations. In 1768 Treaty of Westphalia, in 1815 Vienna Conference mainly highlighted high politics with scope of war and peace. But in modern diplomacy created with multilateral and bilateral relations with non-state actors. Its activities are multitude with law politics elements. On one hand, today's diplomacy subject matters have expanded as health, environment, economic, science, technology etc. On the other hand, expanding range of diplomatic functions with negotiation, consular, representation, communication, reporting to observation, mediation, cultural exchange, public relations and etc.

There is fivefold change in the world of diplomacy with dynamic situation as follows,

1. "In the rapidly expanding numbers and types of actors from governments to national private sector firms, multinational corporation (MNCS), non-governmental organization (NGO) and regional and intergovernmental organizations (INGOs).
2. In the domain and scope of the subject matter or content expanding rapidly to a very broad array of the different sectors of public policy and government activity that extend well beyond traditional "high issue" foreign policy.
3. In the levels at which diplomatic engagement and activity taken place from the local through the domestic-national to the bilateral, regional and global with globalization reducing the height of separation between the different layers.
4. In the apparatus and machinery of foreign relations and diplomacy.
5. In the modes, types and techniques of diplomacy" (Cooper, Heine and Thakur, 2013, p.6).

When focused on 21st century diplomacy occurs and the relationship between agents, in 2010 Hillary Clinton's presentation of the Quadrennial Diplomacy and development review is interesting. Because it stressed the point that diplomacy, development and defense are linked more closely by the challenges of dealing with traditional terrorism and the problems posed by fragile states (Hocking, Melissen, Riordan and Sharp, 2012, p.11). Therefore, fragile states, organized crimes and terrorism that constitutes a central challenge for 21st century diplomacy.

The Research

This paper discusses the problem of diplomatic representation with Realism perspective. The research objective is to evaluate the failure of diplomacy in contemporary diplomatic culture. The research design according to the Research Onion Model. This study is expecting to use Interpretivism research philosophy to articulate data analyses and logically used deductive research method for building arguments for approaching a research problem. As strategies of research, implemented two strategies as case study and archival research. Other than that, research time horizon based on cross-sectional approach.

The researcher mainly utilizes primary and secondary source of data with mono method qualitative approach as research method. The theory of Neo-Realism and concepts of diplomacy, track two diplomacy, globalization and Responsible to Protect (R2P) used for creating theoretical and conceptual framework.

Discussion and Analysis: Failure of Diplomacy

Diplomacy has long experienced a dual effectiveness and legitimacy problem (Hocking, Melissen, Riordan and Sharp, 2012, p.15). Therefore, diplomacy is more dynamic. Hence, success and failure of foreign policy often depends on the way how diplomacy is handled and conducted in political process. Psychological environment, social environment, geopolitical location, cultural and historical factor influence especially national approaches to diplomacy and statecraft. As an example Harold Nicolson mentioned,

1. “British diplomacy had been motivated by the principle of the balance of power.
2. German diplomacy had been “warrior” conception of statecraft born of insecurity over its geographic position in Europe.
3. French diplomacy by the fear of Germany.
4. Italian diplomacy based on opportunism and the desire for manicuring room” (Nicolson, as cited in Russell, 2000, p.161).

Hence, diplomacy is not a single thing. Its collection of various aspects and even one single component can totally failures of diplomacy. First and second world war was a good example for failure of diplomacy of preventing war. European centred diplomacy was failed in preventing war because of state interest of “*Logic of war*”. Therefore, war can be seen as a part of history as biggest failure. Hidden agendas, secret treaties, Bismarck’s policy created situation escalated war and as a result of that, President Woodrow Wilson declared in first point of his fourteen points, speech to congress, “Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understanding of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view” (Wilson, 1918, as cited in Congressional Record, 1918). In 1887 Reinsurance Treaty between German and Russian empire, in 1879 dual-alliance between Austria-Hungary, in 1882 Triple Alliance including Italy, in 1915 The Treaty of London, The Skye’s-Picot Agreement and the Balfour Declaration and Treaty of Bucharest these secret treaties were an instrument of World War I.

After the Second World War established charter of the United Nations (UN) basically article 102 covenant of the League of Nation article 18 emphasized open diplomatic relation. “Every treaty and every international agreement entered into by any member of the UN after the present charter comes into force shall as soon as possible be registered with the secretariat and published by it” (UN Codification Division Publication, 2016). Failure of European diplomacy mainly caused to outbreak world war I and some courses are attributed to it.

Personal failure of leading players responsible for foreign policy and diplomacy ideologies mobilized whole nations, pushed diplomacy towards radical goal and made it less flexible; nations were totally mobilized to wage total war, which could only be won by a total victory. There was no possibility left for compromise. There were new forces that influenced decision-making in diplomacy like the media and public opinion (Ettmayer, 2014).

According to that, some diplomats in all sides created situation to outbreak the

war. As an example,

The French Foreign Minister, Theophile Delcasse, hated Germany so much that he did not want to step on German soil when his train once stopped on Berlin on his way to St. Petersburg. The Russian Foreign Minister and then Ambassador to Paris Alexander Lzvolksy, had similar feeling toward Austria-Hungary. The Russian envoy in Belgrade, Nikolai Hartwig used his strong political influence in the Serbian capital to mobilize against Austria (Ettmayer, 2014).

All the side of war embraced a “Logic of War” based on their realist interests. Shifting power balances, rising nationalism, social-economic stress, changes in technology and military capabilities from previous war. Second World War also remakes failure of diplomatic relations. Rising nationalism remains behind closed door since roots of French revolution. German royal blood with national identity created massive massacre against Jewish. That ideological aspect was driving forces to going war and created war oriented attitude. Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler emerged as war oriented attitude of leading personality with rise of Fascism. It created aggressive nationalism and territorial expansion (Feross, 2012). In the both incidents important of American role was on avoiding war and achieve their national interest. Hans Morgenthau defined “Diplomacy as the art of bringing the different elements of national power to bear with maximum effect upon those points in the international situation which concern the national interest most directly” (Morgenthau, as cited in Cooper, Heine and Thakur, 2013, p.21).

Wilsonian approach on diplomacy mainly concern international cooperation with idealist perspective and introduced 14 points for create peaceful relations. But they were unable to be a part of it and get membership within League of Nation because their isolationism policy. After Second World War USA able to became major power holder in the world, because of their policy. Their arms deal gets large profited from conflict. They used their nuclear power within Japanese civil citizens to achieve their interest of prevent Japan’s power. Furthermore, Roosevelt’s leadership was able to created UN with their idealist

morality and realist strategy. Skilled diplomacy can place themselves in some level of position of others and order to work towards compromise. USA used their diplomacy to achieve their national interest. This situation can be analyzed with Niccolo Machiavelli's ideas as, "Domestic affairs dominate the priority of the state and without domestic stability the state cannot focus on international relations. Diplomacy is essential for the state to maintain power and build a reputation at the international level" (Lamsal, 2014). Therefore, USA always concerns their national interest than any other even within major wars in the world.

Major Powers have been continued their activities until their achievement of interest and they used power were counter balanced by other actors' interest and power. After the establishment of UN as international cooperation to achieve world peace. Are they able to achieve it? That's the question remains from cold war to year 1991. American diplomacy can be characterized with two competing approaches. On one hand, John Lewis Gaddis (1992) pointed out, "Like the British, from whom they inherited the tendency, Americans had traditionally associated their security with the balance of power in the world". On the other hand, Gaddis said, "Since President Woodrow Wilson who led the US into World War I to make the world "safe for democracy" (Gaddis, 1992, as cited in Russell, 2000, p.161). Hence, American diplomacy mixer assumption that democratizes is inherently Pacific and that enemies are non-democratic states. Since cold war to up to now USA invent countries to created democratic states. American policy of "Containment" again the Soviet Union (USSR), strong example for formation and implementation of the American policy. But they are externally very peaceful, cooperation manner with hidden game. That's why Hans Morgenthau (1986) emphasized it through realistic perspective as "Primary purpose of the diplomacy as a promotion of the national interest by peaceful means" (Morgenthau, 1986, as cited in Russell, 2000, p.164).

Within cold war world order USA and USSR both countries continue their power rivalry through proxy wars. That's international community was not able

to effectively prevent this situation because already Security Council handle by these majors and balance of power always remains with them.

In 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations expressed diplomatic practices and convention. Under it Article 3 showed the functions of diplomatic missions as follows.

1. "Representing the sending state in the receiving states.
2. Protecting in the receiving state the interests of the sending states and of its nationals', within the limits permitted by International Law.
3. Negotiating with the government of the receiving state.
4. Ascertaining by all law full means conditions and developments in the receiving state and reporting there on to the government of the sending state.
5. promoting friendly relations between the sending state and the receiving state and developing their economic, cultural and scientific relations" (Vienna Convention, 1961, as cited in Iucu, 2010, p.131).

Collapse of bipolar world order under the new world order the whole creation of international decision making and diplomacy has become more complex and diversified with new actors and new international security agenda.

Therefore, conflict management, security and diplomacy no longer addressed only state centric perspective. It created to address the new global, regional and national issues under the multi-track diplomacy. It transforms club diplomacy to network diplomacy in globalization era with new actors as INGOs, NGO, MNC, individual, regional and other cooperation and trans border flow of good, service, capital, images and data. It created complexity of diplomacy in 21st century. Furthermore, under the multi-track diplomacy there are so many informal actors as business, citizens, research, activism, religion and academic can involve to success or failure of diplomacy. They can influence countries national interest beyond their national borders. It was created considerable changing. Furthermore, type of war has been changed. It became from intrastate conflict to inter-state conflict. The perspective on conflict has expanded as follows.

Table 1.1: Holistic Picture of Conflict

Conflict Prevention	Conflict Management	Conflict Resolutions
Peace Keeping	Peace Making	Peace Building
Responsibility to Prevent	Responsibility to Protect	Responsibility to Rebuild

Source: Wehrenfennig, 2008

There are so many theoretical aspects created. But practically it was failed to perform. As an example, UN main purpose is achieving world peace, nevertheless it failure to achieve peace with current security agendas in many cases. UN peace keeping missions deployed worldwide to achieving peace and peace building. But their responsibility to rebuild peace process was failure. In 1994 Tutsis in Rwanda were victims of genocide. That left between 60,000 and 1 million people dead between April and July 1994. UN Secretary Ban Ki Moon has said “UN is still ashamed over its failure to prevent the genocide of Rwanda. (Moon, 2014, as cited in BBC, 2014). United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNMIR) was failure to empower them to save lives and preventive diplomacy failure because of major power interest. UK and USA had shown no interests to get involved in Rwanda. The failure missions as follows, Kosovo- since June 1999, Israel and Syria- since June 1974, Indian and Pakistan- since 1949, Cyprus- since March 1964, Lebanon- since March 1978, Sudan since- June 2011 and Haiti since- June 2004 not achieves successful peace building under the UN missions (Dodge, 2015). The Rwanda and Srebrenica, Bosnia and Somalia (First humanitarian intervention) are the greatest failure of the UN when protecting civilians.

After the 9/11 attack in 2001, 21st century diplomacy created new realistic in foreign affairs. Because it showed, how non-state actor attack to major unipolar state actor. It’s a step for “humanitarian missions” and that involvement recognized as the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). It was certified that the state has the responsibility for their population. In 2001 ICISS report stated that,

Sovereign states have a responsibility to protect their citizens from avoidable catastrophe from mass murder and rape from starvation. But when they are unwilling or unable to do so, that responsibility must be borne by the border community of that states (International commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001, P. XI).

The UNSC military intervention against Muammar Gaddafi in Libya can be taken as an example. Before that regime change was turned into a fragile state. It's directly affected upon national sovereignty. Otherwise, they intervene in the state without any concern. There were questions remained. What is the legitimacy of this attack? Who is holding that responsibility? USA always assumes that enemies are non-democratic states. But after attack are they able to achieve this target within Syria? That's the failure of diplomacy. Under the major power's interest, small states vulnerable in the world. Sir Robert F. Cooper emphasized, "Diplomacy is partly Newtonian Physics-power, pressure and leverage. But it is also about what people want" (Cooper, as cited in Stanzel, 2018, p.16).

The role of the state has changed rapidly and international environment with expanded foreign policy agenda, diplomacy is facing new challenges. Domestic political challenges always follow it. In contemporary diplomatic culture in US former President Donald Trump created concerted challenges as follows,

1. Trump can be depicted as a return to an older type of diplomacy. Privileging *ad hoc* processes as a means to circumvent all forms of institutionalization whether formal or informal.
2. The operational style of him is focused on personalize detachment from any fixed ideology the use of bilateral one-on-ones.
3. Direct communication with his supporters' combined with and erratic use of twitter (Stanzel, 2018, p.18).

Furthermore, Trump openly declared his suspicion of confidence in the state department in USA. His budget proposal for 2018 cuts its budget significantly and number of important ambassadorial appointment has been postponed such as Mexico, Saudi Arabia and Turkey (Stanzel, 2018, p.24). Core function of diplomacy is representation of their state. Today representation is more complex

and dynamic with these situations. Because it escalated question of “how to represent their state, who distrusts you”. Because representation implies not only status (standing for others) but also behaviour (acting for others) (Stanzel, 2018, p.21).

Other failures impact on diplomats, high commissioners and embassies who became soft targets by terrorist groups. As an examples, ambassador Chris Stevens and others killed in 2012 in Benghazi attack (Stanzel, 2018, p.20). Otherwise, terrorist attacks were targeting the US in between 1969 to 2009, 28% were directly against US diplomatic officers. In 2012 there were 95 attacks against various diplomatic office and more than one-third targeted UN persons (Stanzel, 2018, p.22). Therefor diplomats and diplomatic missions are particularly vulnerable in current scenario.

Other major concern on diplomatic failure was nuclear non-proliferation between nuclear power. Under that North Korean nuclear test created more vulnerable situation for international community. Trump and Kim’s cooperation concern by all over the world because growing nuclear threat from North Korea. But, Hanoi Summit failure exposes Trump’s weak diplomacy. Because they less concerned about rebuild trust between other party.

In the globalized era, security perspective shifted from state centric to human centric. Global warming, SARS, Bird-flu (HSNI), HIV/AIDS and especially current Covid-19 pandemic situation, there are so many non-official involvement and non-state actors are function with specific objectives. In peace process in Northern Ireland, many non-state actors involved and created multi-level dialogue process and created peace network (Wehrenfennig, 2008, p.84). Other example about International campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL). It’s new effective form of diplomacy and heavily involving NGOs.

The question remains were being the legitimacy of this mobilization? Is it sustainable or are they can active over a long time period? Otherwise, most of these institutions and NGOs are based on specific country and build with their

donations and money. Therefor there is question remains legitimacy of these new actors in world area.

Trade and economic relations are building strong relations among countries. Under the trading with the Enemy Act in 1917, The International Emergency Economic Power Act in 1977, US president since Franklin Roosevelt used economic sanctions to conduct US foreign national security policy (Stanzel, 2018, p.13). George W. Bush also used financial sanctions as primary instrument in the global war on terrorism (Stanzel, 2018, p.13). Under that USA arranged economic sanctions towards Iran and Russia. Unilateral economic sanctions used to achieve their power and diplomats are playing a central role to create, implementation and enforcement of economic sanctions. Sometimes major countries are used these sanctions as their weapons. As an example, EU sanctions for Sri Lankan garment and fish with human rights condition. Hence, economic interdependence can reduce conflict. But, small countries felt more vulnerable because under that major countries tries to achieve their interest. Sometimes these commercial diplomacy relations can create benefit for major countries like China. Under the economic relations China involved to change developing countries economic more vulnerable. Chinese- African region economic types created Sphagathi bowl phenomenon within inter-region and intra-states. Chinese economic relation have been not created integration of African countries but polarized. Diplomacy can create victory of all sides with win-win situation. Because effective diplomacy can be preventing any issues. But under the economic relations with center and periphery never created more benefit for developing and less developing periphery countries. All benefits go to center (Major power) to achieve their interest.

Success diplomacy can build peace and trust between or among conflict parties, ensure cooperation and good order in the neighborhood. The use of force is the last resort in diplomacy. But still world remains unresolved peace talks as patch of failure of diplomacy. In 2014 main five peace talks failed.

1. Syrian peace discussions in Geneva (Estimate about 560,000 people

- have been killed during conflict.)
2. Israeli- Palestinian discussions (deaths on both sides were very high)
 3. South Sudan Crisis (383,000 estimated death roll in South Sudan's War) (The New York Times, 2018)
 4. Iran Nuclear discussions under the Trump administration unilaterally withdraw the joint comprehensive plan of action (JCPOA) agreement in May 2018 and impose new renewed sanctions against Iran.
 5. Colombia FARC diplomacy in 2014 rebels kidnapped a senior Colombian army general (DePetris, 2015).

Still, above question remains as unresolved issues in the international community.

Current major failure of diplomacy highlighted within the liberal peace building process in Afghanistan. After twenty years of war against terror and USA and Taliban Doha peace deal created unsuccessful result in the Afghanistan. Because it was unable to make meaningful progress toward establish liberal peace model. Now it was totally under the control of Taliban. It directly affected South Asian regional stability and world stability. Because it's terrorist victory within the region.

There were so many peace discussions facilitation coordination, but these processes were unable to creating best solutions for it. Additionally, there were so many major powers influences can be seen within these conflicts. Still Palestinian not recognizes as state under the UN authority but with *De facto* recognition. As Security Council permanent member USA used veto power as bias to Israeli. Because, there was strategic relations between USA and Israeli. In Syrian case, Russia, China and Iran key supporters for Syrian government and US, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, UK, and France supported the rebels. This situation created another proxy war within inter-state. USA, Russia and China main three members in UNSC and they able to use veto power for achieve their interest. Civilians are the most vulnerable part with bombing of civilian areas and use of chemical weapons. Still any parties were unsuccessful to make any solution for resolving Syrian conflict. Inter-state conflict can impact international level through new war strategies. There were so many non-

proliferation agreements of nuclear and weapons. But, practically it may be unable to handle effectively with major countries' interest.

Additionally, diplomacy fails to concern with the negotiating of conflict issues than with the re-establishing of relationships to rebuild trust between conflict parties. Because conflict is very complex and cannot be resolved by a single approach. Therefore, a conflict can only be successfully resolved (with long-term) when questions of peace, justice, rebuilding and development are addressed (Wehrenfennig, 2008, p.84).

According to the globalization process, the international community is able to connect with each other beyond boundaries. Regionalism raised protection of regional entities within these boundaries less community. Under that, the EU has been an effective story of European diplomacy achievement. But domestic politics can be a challenge to multi-lateral diplomacy. Brexit is a good example on it. British withdrawal from the EU following a referendum. In 2016, 51.9% per cent were voting to support leaving the EU.

There were numerous impacted factors and nationalism can be identified as one of the main fundamental dimensions. The EU expanded with include post-communist countries and anti-diplomatic settlement was most noticeable in the Brexit complaint. British displeasure in moving foreigners to Britain after the EU was formed. On one hand, immigration rises created significant tensions and British continue using currency of Pound. On the other hand, the EU failed to address on increased economic problems since 2008. Increased unemployment rate can be identified as an example. Countries were collectively tried to achieve their common interest. But most of states are primary concern about their national interests and national security.

The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) was an example for failure of Multi-lateral diplomacy. SAARC member countries were failed to develop effective confidence building measures since it started. Other

than that, historical mistrust between Pakistan and Indian was deeply impact on the SAARC Organization. Their relationship characterized as chilling on the war on peace syndrome. Several SAARC summit was unable to held, because of the tension situations. India was not participating in 2016 summit which was to be held in Islamabad after the terrorist attack in India. Otherwise power balancing and mutual unrest between two countries may depend on the nuclear power. In 2019 March Pulwama attack was re-escalated tension between both countries and it directly impact of SAARC failures. With non-interference condition SAARC not involved to solving states' bilateral issues. Therefore, domestic politics should be able to challenge failure of collective diplomacy.

In 21st century digital diplomacy is updatable tool of diplomacy. Social media becomes stronger and more sophisticated in current scenario and it's most effective under multi-track diplomacy. Revolution of internet based global communication was radically challenged. Both state and non-state actors used media according to their interest realization propaganda. Digitalization diplomatic practices can be able to created many failures in diplomacy. In digital diplomacy, Fake news can emerge as threats and undermine the trust of global public opinion. Additionally, it clearly affects both national security policy and domestic policies.

The Arab Spring's Facebook and twitter campaigns created hot spots in international arena. Through the current scenario, the cyber security became under the treat and it created more than physical damages. New warfare tactics used by Russian military intelligence during 2016 US Presidential election has in fact directly tapped in to these questions by interplaying with popularity and attention metrics as they distributed sensational. "Fake" news to feed in to partisan divides on Face Book, Twitter and You Tube (Stanzel, 2018, p.35).

More than 150 million Americans were exposed to Russian disinformation campaign prior to the 2016 presidential election, which was almost eight times more the number of people who watched the evening news broadcasts of ABC, CBS, NBC and Fox Stations in 2016 (Bjola & Pamment, 2019).

This largest disinformation created negative political impacts, especially current foreign affairs, missions and embassy. Because fake news or fabricated stories were looked real. Specially, terrorist groups and hackers are using media propaganda to created threats for international stability. ISIS highly used these techniques to explore their radical Muslim through to attract worldwide people. Against that Tillerson's emphasized strong message as, "A digital caliphate must not flourish in the place of a physical one" (Melissen, 2018). It can cause interference in a poisonous mix with calculated insults by leaders that impact public opinion and the ongoing conversation between states. Example about, Hilary Clinton sold weapons to ISIS. Lithuanian President Dalia Grybauskaitė has never been a KGB agent and incest is not a norm in Modern Europe. Both are suggested by fake news originating from Russia (Melissenha, 2018).

Currently, Covid-19 is being a global pandemic and need global solution on making progress. A single state cannot survive individually from this pandemic. Therefore, health diplomacy be a new and multi-faceted phenomenon toward and beyond cross border. But there was huge gap among developed, developing and less developing countries regarding vaccination and health assistances against pandemic. Because some developed countries following "my country first approach" toward vaccination considering their national interest (Unmüßig and Sitenko, 2021, p.4). World Health Organization (WHO) created COVAX vaccination programme to donated vaccine for developing countries. But vaccine egotism always behind the screen with vaccine nationalism. Because some powerful states hope to achieved their interest within the pandemic. On one hand, America and Europe always behave their first policy and they already hope to vaccinate third dose for their citizens. On the other hand, The EU has exported 34 million doses to 31 countries, of which nine million went to the

UK, three million each to Canada and Mexico, and two million to Japan, meaning that the majority of its exports went to countries that either produce their own vaccine or can afford to buy it at market price (Unmüßig and Sitenko, 2021, p.4). The EU's lip service to solidarity and justice is thus far from being fulfilled. According to that vaccination diplomacy was created unbalance global dimension among states. In accordance with UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres (2021) highlighted that by the end of February 2021, 75 percent of the vaccine produced at that point was in the hands of only ten countries, while more than 130 countries had yet to receive a single dose (Guterres, 2021, as cited in Unmüßig and Sitenko, 2021, p.2).

Russia, China and India using this vaccination programs to strategically expand their spheres of political influence for creating new geopolitical realities. Indian role in the SAARC again proved failure of regional diplomacy within the context of Covid pandemic. Indian and other South Asian countries arranged virtual meeting regarding Covid and India proposed SAARC Covid-19 fund to fight the pandemic as a region. Other than that, India also proposed the SAARC Covid-19 information exchange platform for mutual interaction, sharing knowledge and joint research for new diagnostic and mutual learning (Pattanaik, 2021, p.103). Its new trends toward creating regional diplomacy. But there was huge gap between what imaginative and reality. Because bilateral issues between India and Pakistan suffered from policy paralyses and it cased to lack collective effect toward pandemic. India created bilateral relation with other through Vaccine *Maitri* and other medical assistance except Pakistan. Under that situation vaccines are increasingly used to establish long-term political dependencies in geopolitical competition especially in countries that cannot produce their own vaccines and health facilities (Unmüßig and Sitenko, 2021, p.4)). State want to responses built on new diplomatic strategic of global health diplomacy, vaccine diplomacy and science diplomacy.

But there were lack of cooperation, political divisions and mistrust among each other. Unfortunately, WHO also faced lack of responsibility of Covid. Because

of politicization of the pandemic. WHO is an organization based on members' funds. That's why its outbreak response is an effective mechanism. Otherwise, the USA cut-off their funds for WHO. But WHO is unable to do anything for it as a non-binding organization. They were unable to punish or approve and resolution against any country who cut-off their funds.

Other than that, changes in global environment government and environment diplomacy play a significant role in the current scenario. But still states fail to adopt possible binding mechanisms to respond collectively for climate change. There were numerous negotiations, conventions and declarations regarding environmental governance. Such as, 1985 Vienna Convention on Protecting the Ozone Layer, 1987 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development, 1992 UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity, 1997 Kyoto Protocol and etc. Environment and Development were set up as a top level of international agenda in 1992 with Earth Summit in Rio with heads of states (Blaxekjær, 2016, p.2). These multilateral negotiations aimed to discuss global environmental issues because environmental problems are too critical to deal with by a single country and it must be a collective effort. But there were overlapping between global south and north. Otherwise, there were absent clear, effective, binding, and transparent mechanisms to integrate the process.

Environmental, economic and health diplomacy are new dynamics in the diplomacy field in the current globalization scenario. It can go beyond state borders and connect each other avoiding other political barriers. Because these are global common problems and want to create global solutions to resolve the situation in the 21st century. Therefore, diplomacy wants to be moderate with creative diplomacy to address these contemporary issues.

Conclusion

The evaluation of diplomacy was positioned in 21st century with more complex and dynamic way. Diplomats and diplomacy were more associated with peace than conflict and dialogue and negotiation than with hate. But it required handling with strategically mind. When diplomats adopt negative tones in their communication, return came with negative public expectation. Because diplomat is representing the state. Today growing complexity of inter-state and intra state relations in a more globalized as well as localized world. Therefore, many state centric approaches to diplomacy were revised with new non-state actors of international community. Use of force is the last resort in diplomacy. The negotiation, mediation, peace talks, peaceful settlement of disputes are the preferable options in the ambit of diplomacy. Because diplomacy can exactly build peace, ensure cooperation, trust building and perfect relation among state. Always diplomacy is acting with the idealist morality and realist strategy when deal with international disputes. Failure of diplomacy created more negative aspect since it happened. Totally, we were unable to avoid failure of diplomacy. Because it be a perfect answer for the dynamic situation in world arena. Therefore, success or failure of foreign policy depend on effective diplomacy.

References

- Bjola, C. and Pamment J. (2018). *The dark side of digital diplomacy: countering disinformation and propaganda. Countering Online Propaganda and Extremism*. Routledge. Retrieved from:
<http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/wcm/connect/cb0ae82d-f624-4ba9-8e9b-a1ec3569d832/AR15-2019-Bjola-Dark-side-digital-diplomacy-countering-disinformation-propaganda.pdf>
- Cooper, A.F., Heine, J. and Thakur, R. (2013). *Introduction: The Challenges of 21st Century Diplomacy. Oxford Handbooks Online*. [PDF], (Pp. 1-34). Retrieved from:
https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199588862.001.0001/ox_fordhb-9780199588862-e-1
- Congressional Record, 65th Congress 2nd Session (1918). Woodrow Wilson Speech on the Fourteen Points. Retrieved from:
<https://web.viu.ca/davies/H101/Wilson.14points.htm>
- Freeman C. W. & Marks, S. (2019). Diplomacy. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/diplomacy>
- Hocking, B., Melissen, J., Riordan, S. and Sharp, P. (2012). *Futures for Diplomacy: Integrative Diplomacy in the 21st Century (Report No. 1)*. Netherlands: Netherlands Institute of International Relations. Retrieved from: <https://www.clingendael.org/publication/futures-diplomacy-integrative-diplomacy-21st-century>
- Iucu, O. (2010). Diplomacy and Diplomatic Functions. *Leadership, Mentoring, Coaching and Motivation*, No 11, Pp.129-133. Retrieved from:
http://manager.faa.ro/download/615_1114.pdf
- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. (2001). *The Responsibility to Protect*. Ottawa, Canada: The International Development Research Centre. Retrieved from:
<http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%2520Report.pdf>
- Lamsal, Y.N. (2014). *Realm of Realism in Diplomacy*. Retrieved from:
<http://therisingnepal.org.np/news/13899>
- Nijman, J. (2005). *International Law & Justice Working Paper*. New York, NY: New York University School of Law. Retrieved from:
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1560742
- Pattanaik, S.S. (2021). COVID-19 Pandemic and India's Regional Diplomacy. *South Asian Survey*, 28(1), Pp. 92–110. Retrieved from:
<https://www.idsa.in/idsanews/covid-19-pandemic-and-india-regional-diplomacy>
- Russell, R. (2000). American Diplomatic Realism: A Tradition practiced and preached by Gorge F. Kennan. *Diplomacy and statecraft, Vol.11 (3)*, Pp. 159-182. Retrieved from:
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09592290008406175>
- Stanzel, V. (2018). *New Realities in Foreign Affairs: Diplomacy in the 21st Century (Report No. 11)*. Berlin, Germany: German Institute for International and Security Affairs. Retrieved from: <https://www.swp-berlin.org/en/publication/new-realities-in-foreign-affairs-diplomacy-in->

- [the-21st-century/](#)
and its implications. *The Green Political Foundation*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.boell.de/en/2021/03/25/divided-we-fail-vaccine-diplomacy-and-its-implications>
- Wehrenfennig, D. (2008). Multi-track Diplomacy and Human Security. *Journal of Human Security, Vol 07*, Pp. 80-86. Retrieved from:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/296668093_Multi-Track_Diplomacy_and_Human_Security
- Feross, A. (2012, November 17). The Failure of Diplomacy. Retrieved from:
<https://www.apstudynotes.org/us-history/topics/the-failures-of-diplomacy/>
- BBC. (2014, April 7). Rwanda Genocide: UN ashamed says Ban Ki- moon. *BBC News*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-26917419>
- Ettmayer, W. (2014, August 11). World War I: Why did European Diplomacy Fail- Could It Happen Today. Retrieved from:
<https://acuns.org/world-war-i-why-did-european-diplomacy-fail-could-it-happen-today/>
- Broughton, J. (2014, September 25). Letters: War is the Ultimate failure of Diplomacy. *Independent*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/letters/letters-war-is-the-ultimate-failure-of-diplomacy-9756323.html>
- DePetris, D. (2015, January 3). 5 Peace talks that failed in 2014. *The National Interest*. Retrieved from: <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/5-peace-talks-failed-2014-11955>
- Dodge, S. (2015, September 28). What have been the successes and failures of UN peacekeeping missions. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/bosnia/11729436/Srebrenica-20-years-on-What-have-been-the-successes-and-failures-of-UN-peacekeeping-missions.html>
- Blaxekjær, L.O. (2016, May 29). New Practices and Narratives of Environmental Diplomacy. *E- International Relations*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.e-ir.info/2016/05/29/new-practices-and-narratives-of-environmental-diplomacy/>
- UN Coordination Division Publication. (2016, August 23). *Repertory of Practice of United Nations Organs*. Retrieved from:
<http://legal.un.org/repertory/art102.shtml>
- Melissen, J. (2018, February 1). *Fake News and What (Not) to do about it*. Retrieved from: <https://www.clingendael.org/publication/fake-news-and-what-not-do-about-it>
- Unmüßig, B. & Sitenko, A. (2021, April 1). Divided we fail - Vaccine diplomacy