

Review article

Diplomacy in the context of international security – retrospection and present day

Martyna Krocak 

Faculty of Security Sciences,
General Tadeusz Kościuszko Military University of Land Forces, Wrocław, Poland,
e-mail: mar.krocak@gmail.com

INFORMATION

Article history:

Submitted: 10 November 2020

Accepted: 21 November 2022

Published: 15 December 2022

ABSTRACT

The research conducted for this article aimed to explore the development of diplomacy (the research subject) over the years in the context of its influence on international security.

The paper characterizes diplomacy and explores its development, including examples of international security activities undertaken by the international community applying diplomacy.

The analysis of Polish and foreign literature sources and domestic and international law acts, with the use of content analysis technique, was employed as a research method.

KEYWORDS

diplomacy, international security, international relations,
international organizations



© 2022 by Author(s). This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY). <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Introduction

Scientific studies often define *security* as the possibility of free development, regardless of the subject it concerns. The need for its satisfaction accompanies both a human as an individual and the authorities made up by society at the local (local government), national (e.g., parliaments and executive bodies), and international levels [1, p. 16].

International security is the subjective lack of fear of threats and the international community's joint action to protect state and non-state (social) values through norms, institutions, and instruments ensuring peaceful settlement of disputes, as well as creating ecological, social, and economic prerequisites for intensive stabilization and elimination of threats [2, p. 17].

Its provision is a consequence of both the security degree of individual states (resulting from the power structures' activities in ensuring the independence of the state, maintaining territorial integrity, political independence, the independence of the judiciary, the democratic election of representatives of the authority, and satisfying the citizens' basic needs, including self-development) [3, p. 89-95] and the degree of international order, being the outcome of

the shape of international relations. They are implemented in two ways, namely, in the form of bilateral cooperation agreements between states [4, p. 1] and as multilateral cooperation agreements, both within the framework of non-institutional cooperation (e.g., Visegrad Group, Tri-Cities), and institutional one – within the framework of international organizations of regional (e.g., European Union EU), sub-regional (e.g., Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe – OSCE), and global (e.g., United Nations – UN) character [5, p. 42-44].

Assessment of the most effective form of implementation of international relations (also in the context of international security) has for years been the subject of dispute between representatives of science and politics. Advocates of the theory of political realism (including Niccolò Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, Kenneth Waltz) believe that the states, which should strive for competition within the balance of power and indicate the dominant role in international relations of the so-called hard power factor, associated with the military and economic potential of states, are the main participants in international relations [6, p. 106-107]. The implementation of this concept in recent history was visible primarily in the so-called Cold War period, in the form of rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union and the military blocs (the North Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Pact, respectively) and economic ones centered around them.

A different view on the most effective form of implementing international relations is presented by the theorists of political liberalism (including Immanuel Kant, Adam Smith, Thomas Woodrow Wilson). Unlike the representatives of realism, they believe that the main participants in international relations are states associated within international organisations and alliances, which should strive not for rivalry, but for the closest possible cooperation. Soft power factors such as civil liberties or democratic ideas are associated with this theory [6, p. 138].

A different opinion on the most effective form of implementing international relations is presented by the theorists of political liberalism (e.g., Immanuel Kant, Adam Smith, Thomas Woodrow Wilson). Unlike the representatives of realism, they claim that primarily states associated in international organizations and alliances, which should strive not for rivalry but the closest possible cooperation, actively participate in international relations. Soft power factors such as civil liberties or democratic ideas are associated with this theory [6, p. 138].

The concept of the institutionalization of international relations is related to the theory of liberalism in them. In their view, the most effective form of ensuring international security is the transfer of some competencies (and thus part of the sovereignty) by states to the authorities of the international organizations they create, which then represent their interests in external relations more effectively than in the case of each state acting individually [7, p. 310]. The activities aim to expand international integration, thus leading to joint efforts to ensure international security [8, p. 43].

This trend was especially noticeable after the end of the Second World War when effectively functioning (in contrast, for example, to the pre-existing League of Nations [9, p. 28]) international organizations such as the UN or NATO were established.

Another example of the implementation of that concept is the European Union, which in external relations, both political and economic, is a stronger player in the confrontation with China, the United States, or the Russian Federation than each of its member states individually. As for military security, the North Atlantic Alliance is an example of the institutionalization of international relations. At the same time, participation in international organizations always entails the necessity to work out shared positions through internal compromises. It is frequently not easy to achieve (e.g., in the case of different concepts of solving the so-called

migration crisis among the EU Member States or the lack of unanimity among the permanent representatives of the UN Security Council).

That is further emphasized by the fact that the international community is created precisely by states, especially in the period of increased globalization [10, p. 62-63], that is, the process of globally perceived overall socio-economic development in interconnectedness and interdependence [2, p. 44].

In turn, the leading role of cultural factors in international relations is attributed by advocates of the theory of constructivism (among others Nicholas Onuf, Alexander Wendt). Cultural diversity, which has been present in the world since the first civilizations were formed, makes the participants of international relations include representatives from different cultural groups, presenting different values, traditions, customs, religions, and languages. Thus, constructivists assume that international relations are not only the ones between states or international organizations but go far beyond their borders, which is associated with the existence of many, often significantly diversified cultures in their sphere [11, p. 439]. Thus, in the constructivists' opinion, multiculturalism resulting from progressive globalization is a factor that plays an essential role in international relations, and its significance is constantly increasing, often having a fundamental impact on the course of international negotiations. Therefore, disregarding these differences or underestimating them may give rise to diplomatic disputes and even armed conflicts.

It is noteworthy that in legal terms, the ability to enter into international relations is following the provisions of the Montevideo Convention and in addition to a permanent population, sovereign power, and a specific territory (the size of the state does not affect its subjectivity) separated from other states by a border, a *sine qua non* condition for the existence of a state as a subject of international law [12, Art. 1]. Therefore, this legal requirement that, regardless of the views represented by the authorities, each state must pursue a permanent foreign policy of establishing, maintaining, and developing international relations in accordance with its interests and while respecting the provisions of the international law. The concept of diplomacy is intrinsically linked to international relations since it constitutes one of their essential tools. In the aspect of security, diplomacy makes it possible to build security in the international environment, which translates into the security of individual states as well.

Thus, in the context of the above considerations, it was reasonable to examine how diplomacy has developed over the years and its impact on international security.

Given this objective, the question addressed in the paper reads: To what extent do diplomatic activities in retrospect and the present day influence international security?

When analyzing the influence, one should not forget about the specialized branches of diplomacy. It comprises defense diplomacy associated with the activities of the armed forces and coercive diplomacy linked to using threats in international relations to exert pressure on another entity, resulting in its failure to meet initial objectives (deterrence) or the implementation of specific actions against its will (coercion). In the literature, R. Kupiecki [13] and L. Drab's [14] devoted their works to the first of them. Whereas F. Charillon, T. Balzacq, F. Ramel [15], and J. Sutor's [16] publications address the second one. However, the exploration of these areas requires a separate analysis, so the article focuses on presenting the general history of diplomacy in the context of its influence on international security, along with presenting specific examples.

Before exploring that aspect, it is first necessary to define the concept of diplomacy itself to structure the considerations that follow.

1. The concept of diplomacy and its typology

The concept of diplomacy has been subject to numerous attempts to be defined throughout history unambiguously. Based on the public sphere analysis, it is not infrequently misidentified with foreign policy, which is a part of the policy pursued by state authorities focused on international activities. It is oriented towards the realization of the states' interests through specific means and methods. Therefore, diplomacy is the main foreign policy instrument for pursuing national interests. Even though it consists of the maintenance of official diplomatic relations, it is not an identical concept.

The descriptiveness of diplomacy can also be observed from the analysis of sources.

A. Ciupiński explains diplomacy as “the ongoing performance of specific tasks set by foreign policy”. The researcher considers it as “the tactics that states apply to fight, cooperate, and compete among themselves” [17, p. 16].

R. Kupiecki describes diplomacy as “an integrated instrument of the state’s foreign policy subordinated to national constitutional decision-making centers and using from the common resource of forces and resources (budget, human capital, the state thought, etc.)” [13, p. 18].

E. Guillon and R. Zenderowski propose another formulation of diplomacy, and M. Krycki, who specify it as “the influence of public attitudes on the formation and implementation of foreign policy activities, including dimensions of international relations outside traditional diplomacy: governments’ forming public opinion in other countries, the relationship of private groups and interests of one country with another, reporting on foreign affairs and their impact on policy, communication between those who professionally deal with communication (diplomats and foreign correspondents), and the intercultural communication process” [18, p. 19].

When analyzing diplomacy from a legal perspective, O.E. Braniewicz, following R. Bulajic, considers as its main role “the formation of relations between states and between them and other actors of these relations, and in particular advice, creation and implementation (execution) of state foreign policy under the principles of international law” [19, p. 8].

The researcher attributes the following functions to diplomacy:

- creating the international space of general principles, or changing them,
- creating conditions and legal bases for effective cooperation at the bilateral, regional, and global level,
- peaceful settlement of disputes,
- concluding agreements, conventions, and treaties,
- realizing bilateral and multilateral cooperation within trade, fiscal, investment, scientific, and cultural cooperation [19, p. 8].

The concept of diplomacy can be analyzed on three planes [20, p. 38]:

- building relations with subjects of international relations,
- scientific,
- institutional.

The first plane is related to the external activity of diplomatic representatives, aimed at building relations with other states, ensuring the protection of national interests and citizens outside the country.

S. Miłosz is convinced that, on the scientific plane, diplomacy is considered as “all the methods and means of achieving the objectives of national foreign policy, building and maintaining

relations between states, including mainly conducting negotiations and concluding treaties” [20, p. 38].

The third one defines diplomacy as a team of people qualified to perform diplomatic and consular service and an organizational apparatus that includes the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and permanent and ad hoc diplomatic missions [20, p. 38].

However, diplomatic activities are conducted at the tactical level directly by diplomatic missions (embassies, consulates, and attaché offices) and the strategic level.

On the example of Poland, based on the analysis of the most important legal act, namely, the Constitution, it can be indicated that the bodies entitled to conduct such activities are the President and the Council of Ministers, and in the legislative field also the Sejm and the Senate (in which foreign affairs committees operate; in the Senate it is called the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the European Union).

According to Article 133 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, the President is the representative of the state in external relations, and his/her tasks include:

- ratifying and terminating international agreements and notifying the Sejm and the Senate thereof (with the possibility of prior application to the Constitutional Tribunal for verification of its compliance with the Constitution of the Republic of Poland),
- appointing and dismissing Poland’s representatives in other states and international organizations,
- accepting letters of credence and recalling accredited diplomatic representatives of other states and international organizations [21, Art. 133].

Pursuant to Article 133 of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, the President is the representative of the state in external relations, and his/her tasks in this respect include:

- exercising general responsibility for relations with other states and international organizations,
- concluding international agreements requiring ratification, and approving and terminating such agreements [21, Art. 146, para. 4, p. 9-10].

Regardless of the adopted definition of diplomacy, the establishment of international cooperation for self-development and regional and global development, including in the field of security and the creation for this purpose of administrative back-up and relevant legal norms, should be considered. Diplomacy is a complex concept, which is why its fundamental division can be made, depending on the criterion of the number of parties involved in it [22, p. 53].

According to the division mentioned above, diplomacy can be bilateral and multilateral. The former is characterized by building and maintaining relations between two states, taking the individual interests of both parties into account. On the other hand, multilateral diplomacy is conducted by states in a group or towards a group of states. Such a group may be formed to discuss a specific issue of international importance, and then such activities are referred to as conference diplomacy. The second case is the institutional form of cooperation analyzed at the beginning of this article, within international organizations, to which states delegate part of their competencies [17, p. 16].

Besides the number of actors involved in the cooperation, the second difference between multilateral and bilateral diplomacy is the fact that the cooperation takes into consideration the interests of the entire international community, and not just the two parties involved.

All forms of interaction in international relations are also related to the concept of multilateral diplomacy. They include [17, p. 16]:

- interactions of states cooperating with each other in the framework of achieving a set strategic goal for a given group (e.g., joint organization of the International Conference on Economic Cooperation of the Regions of the Visegrad Group States),
- interactions of states with international organizations (e.g., economic cooperation of Norway and Switzerland with the European Union), and of international organizations with the authorities of individual states (e.g., OSCE negotiations with the authorities of Yugoslavia on the establishment of peace in Kosovo in 1998-1999),
- mutual interaction between members of international organizations (e.g., cooperation within NATO or the European Union).

2. History of diplomacy

The origins of diplomacy date back to ancient times. Its history began with the formation of the first social groups, which over time began to cooperate [23, p. 48]. The establishment of diplomatic relations could then be observed, among others, in Egypt, Greece, and Rome. In ancient Greece, amphictyonies were created, which in modern nomenclature are international organizations of a political nature, for example, the Delphic-Thermopylae amphictyony, which brought together twelve city-states – polis [24, p. 29]. On the other hand, symmachies were unions of states with a defensive character, created for collective defense (e.g., the Peloponnesian Union).

In the context of international security, the role of diplomacy in the peaceful dispute settlement was first officially recognized by the Roman politician Cicero, saying that: “there are two ways of settling disputes; one by argument, the other by force, and since the former is proper to human and the latter to wild animals, one should resort to the latter way only when they cannot use the former” [25, p. 15-16].

Even though he spoke those words in the first century B.C., they are valid until modern times, and those assumptions are realized in activities for peace, e.g., by the organization United Nations.

During the Middle Ages, the main results of diplomatic activities were establishing unions of Italian cities and the Hanseatic League, which significantly influenced the development of international trade. Medieval diplomacy was distinguished by ceremonial forms, high effectiveness in establishing trade, religious, and cultural relations, and the resulting benefits for each party to such agreements.

Nonetheless, it seems that the key historical epoch for the development of diplomacy was modernity. It was only then that efforts to create an international system of norms started alongside the formation and spread of the principle of sovereignty of states. The first permanent diplomatic representations began to be created to maintain order in Europe, initiated by the treaties analyzed later in this article [24, p. 44].

The modern period is connected to many long-lasting wars in Europe, bringing death to hundreds of thousands of people, above all, the Thirty Years' War and the Napoleonic Wars.

One of the results of diplomatic activities in that period was signing the treaty ending the Thirty Years' War between Sweden and the Habsburgs at the Westphalian Congress in Osnabruck in 1648. An identical treaty in Munster was concluded between the Holy Roman Empire and

France, thus making the so-called Peace of Westphalia [22, p. 30]. Those agreements recognized the states' sovereignty and equality as the basic principles in international relations. In the context of diplomacy, it was then customary to establish the posts of ambassadors and residents as two classes of diplomatic representatives within the diplomatic rank.

However, in the aftermath of the French offensive on the European front that lasted more than twenty years, diplomatic norms and principles, including multilateral diplomacy, were systematized on such a significant scale for the first time. They all aimed to stabilize the political situation in Europe to prevent the reescalation of conflict and thus strengthen international security.

2.1. Diplomacy from the Congress of Vienna to the League of Nations

The Congress of Vienna undoubtedly began a new, so-called era of congresses in international relations. It was convened for the international deliberation after the abdication of Emperor Napoleon I (Bonaparte) following the defeat of French troops against the international anti-French coalition (the Napoleonic Wars finally ended a year later at Waterloo with the defeat of French troops under N. Bonaparte's command). The first meeting was organized on such a large scale that it brought together numerous representatives of European states and lasted intermittently from September 1814 to June 1815. Its purpose was to establish a new political and legal order favorable to the interests of the victors in the cited wars. The new concept of ensuring international security in Europe was to establish the so-called balance of power between the then five powers [26, p. 72]. Because of their dictate in the international environment, the concept is also called the "concert of powers" (Great Britain, Russia, Austria – since 1867 Austro-Hungary, Prussia – since 1871 Germany, and in subsequent years also France and Italy) [9, p. 21]. In addition to initiating peace and the new shape of borders, Congress also attempted to normalize the pan-European political order. Among other things, full sovereignty was granted to all European states; however, due to the dominating influence of the quoted powers, the geopolitical situation could be created only by them in the newly created system of international relations. Another critical congressional decision was the formal abolition of the slave trade.

In the context of diplomacy, the custom from the Peace of Westphalia on the establishment outposts was then codified. The Vienna Rules of Procedure, establishing the principles of precedence of diplomatic representatives were written on March 19, 1815, and attached to the General Act of Congress (these principles were later supplemented in the Aachen Protocol of 1818) to avoid disputes arising from terminological and formal issues that were not fully settled.

It established the rules of diplomatic precedence and created three classes of diplomatic representatives:

- ambassadors (who were given a representative character),
- deputies,
- chargé d'affaires (deputy heads of diplomatic missions – ambassadors) [24, p. 70].

As can be observed from the cited examples, the 19th century was undoubtedly a period of dynamic development of multilateral diplomacy. Between 1839 and 1900 there were 191 international organizations and several multilateral agreements, covering cultural, economic, and political areas [24, p. 133-134].

The increased importance of diplomacy in creating international security in the 19th century can also be seen by comparing the times before and after the Congress of Vienna. In the

192 years between the Congress of Westphalia and the Congress of Vienna, only a few dozen conferences were held, mainly related to making peace after ongoing wars. On the other hand, there were almost 1200 such conferences in the years 1840-1900 [17, p. 45-46]. In the context of international security, another success of the diplomatic efforts in the nineteenth century, besides leading to a lasting peace for many years and the abolition of slavery, was the codification of the first act of international law in the field of the International Humanitarian Law (IHL), namely, the Convention for the Amelioration of the Fate of Military Injuries in Armies in the Field of Force of 1864. It established the sign of the red cross on a white background, which is still protected under this legal act of military medical services [27, p. 20]. That event undoubtedly revolutionized the conduct of wars, as it created (along with subsequent acts of the IHL) the scope of rights and obligations of the warring parties, emphasizing protecting veterans and civilians from unnecessary suffering and cultural property from destruction.

In the context of the above considerations, from the perspective of international security, the assumptions of the Congress of Vienna and their subsequent implementation should be considered highly effective, as they allowed for the maintenance of peace in Europe for nearly a century. However, war broke out in Europe in 1914. It then spread to other continents and reached a global character. That was a hitherto unknown phenomenon at the time, so the end of the 1918 war forced the international community to create new rules and forms of cooperation to ensure that there would never be military action on such a large scale in the future (which, as history shows, was ultimately never realized). The idea of institutional cooperation and the creation of a global international organization aimed at maintaining peace in the world emerged among world leaders.

As indicated by B. Ociepa, traditional diplomacy was previously understood as a secret activity and reserved only for a narrow circle of politicians negotiating international agreements often conducted to the disadvantage of individuals or third countries [28, p. 20]. Thus, 14 points promulgated in 1918 by then U.S. President T.W. Wilson constituted a breakthrough in the context of understanding diplomacy. According to the first point, diplomacy was to operate openly and publicly (no secret understanding of any kind) [28, p. 20].

The institutional character of cooperation was intended to be more successful than mere cooperation through agreements, as in the case of the Congress of Vienna. The international community's efforts significantly influenced by T.W. Wilson's ideas brought with them the establishment of the League of Nations on June 28, 1919. On June 28, 1919, the League of Nations – the first-ever international organization with a global scope and a wide range of functions – was set up with its headquarters in Geneva.

2.2. Multilateral diplomacy during the League of Nations period

The League of Nations was established as a universal international organization, which aimed to develop multifaceted cooperation, maintain peace and security, reduce armaments, and assist in developing non-self-governing nations. Its structure consisted of the Secretariat, one of whose tasks was to maintain contact with member states, the Assembly (a plenary body), the Council (an executive body, consisting of four permanent members – Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan, and four rotating non-permanent members), the Permanent Court of International Justice (established to settle disputes between member states), and the International Labor Organization [29, p. 97-98].

The creation of the League of Nations brought with itself many changes to the previous form of diplomacy. The supremacy of law created under its activities resulted in the expiration of

all existing agreements between its member states. Moreover, the treaties that conflicted with the provisions of the League of Nations Pact, which had been an integral part of the 1919 Treaty of Versailles establishing peace and a new division of Europe's borders, ceased to be in force.

In the context of diplomatic activity for peace and international security during the League of Nations period, initiatives such as the Geneva Protocol of June 17, 1925, on the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating and Poisonous Gases and Similar Bacteriological Agents (as the ICCPR Act), or the Briand-Kellogg Pact of August 27, 1928, providing for the renunciation of war, should also be mentioned. In 1928, the Sixth Conference of the Pan-American States adopted the Havana Convention, which concerned the functioning of diplomatic agents, but that document had only a regional character, limited to the countries-signatories from both Americas [17, p. 20].

The international community's efforts to build lasting peace in the world, which was the League of Nations' main objective, ultimately proved insufficient, as evidenced by the outbreak of World War II. The ineffectiveness can be reasoned by the United States' failure to join the organization as one of the super-powers, and the members' failure to sufficiently fulfill the framework documents, which was manifested in the 1930s by military aggression of its member states: Japan (against China), Italy (against Abyssinia – today's Ethiopia), and the USSR (against Finland). Consequently, Japan and Italy withdrew from the League of Nations, while the USSR was excluded from it because of its actions [29, p. 114]. After the NSDAP party won the parliamentary elections, Germany also left the ranks of the League of Nations in 1933.

As history has shown, renewed aggression in international relations soon led to the outbreak of World War II. The League of Nations then *de facto* lost the sense of further functioning and was finally dissolved in 1946. However, during World War II, the Allied side took diplomatic action to create a new global security organization to replace the League of Nations. In 1941, the United States and Great Britain signed the Atlantic Charter, which announced creating a permanent system of universal security [30, p. 300-301]. The USSR also joined the Charter in the same year and the remaining states of the anti-Hitler coalition in 1942 [30, p. 300].

In its final form, the UN was established by 51 states based on an international agreement on April 25, 1945, during the founding conference in San Francisco. Its headquarters became New York City, and the agreement entered into force on October 24, 1945. The UN structure mirrored the League of Nations' one. The General Assembly, the Security Council, the Secretariat, the Economic and Social Council, and the International Court of Justice became its organs.

The UN's charter document became the United Nations Charter, which set out the objectives of the newly formed organization. They have not changed until modern times and include:

- maintaining world peace and security,
- developing international cooperation,
- protecting human rights and dignity,
- promoting economic, cultural and social progress [31, Art. 1].

The UN has been granted the following competencies to achieve these objectives:

- preventing all threats to peace,
- suppressing all acts of aggression and terror,
- mitigating or settling disputes by peaceful means under the principles of international law [31, Art. 1].

2.3. Diplomacy in the Cold War period

After the end of the Second World War, global diplomacy focused primarily on implementing the established new peace system.

In the context of international security, the period of the so-called Cold War was associated with the bipolar configuration of the world and its symmetrical division into American and Soviet spheres of influence. The rivalry between the two world powers essentially introduced antagonism between them, which somewhat hindered regional and global cooperation. Hence, diplomacy at the time was primarily concerned with relations between representatives of the two blocs and the international organizations they created, such as NATO, the European Communities (the European Coal and Steel Community, the European Economic Union, the European Atomic Energy Community) in the Western bloc, and the Warsaw Pact and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in the Eastern bloc.

Relations between the superpowers were normalized in the 1960s following the so-called Cuban Missile Crisis. At that time, among other things, the so-called hotline (telephone line) was established between their leaders, which was a tool for instant communication in situations of diplomatic disputes. The so-called Cuban Missile Crisis and the earlier armed conflicts in Korea and Vietnam demonstrated the need for both superpowers to promptly resolve growing problems and threats in the international community by engaging in dialogue to prevent them from escalating. The process was gradual, and the basis of its effectiveness was building mutual trust, and in the next stage, the construction of means of maintaining balance and protection against destabilization. To this end, several bilateral talks were undertaken, later extended to the level of international organizations.

The afore-mentioned building of mutual trust was based mainly on concluding arms control agreements, including developing nuclear technology and refraining from the threat of using force against each other and the other party's allied states. The primary consequence was the signing of an inter-bloc agreement between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

The most significant acts of international law resulting from diplomatic action for international security in the Cold War period are also as follows:

- the four 1949 Geneva Conventions for the Protection of Victims of War with Additional Protocols,
- the 1967 Outer Space Treaty (prohibiting its militarization),
- the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty,
- the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, concluded between the USA and the USSR,
- the 1972 Treaty on Restrictions on the Development of Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Systems, concluded between the USA and the USSR,
- the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT I) of 1972 and SALT II of 1979, concluded between the US and the USSR.

However, in the period under review, there were also decisive diplomatic successes resulting in the two powers' effective cooperation for the sake of international security. The tool that made such actions possible was the UN's realization of peacekeeping operations understood as "the prevention, reduction, mitigation, and cessation of hostilities between or within states through the peaceful intervention of a third party, organized and directed by an international organization using military, police and civilian personnel to restore and maintain peace" [2,

p. 87]. They involve using multinational military and civilian forces operating under UN supervision to resolve internal or international conflicts. The powers to establish them are held by the General Assembly, the Security Council, and the Secretary-General.

In this context, it should be noted that peacekeeping operations consist of peacekeeping missions and operations with the use of a military contingent – the UN Peacekeeping Forces. The term “peacekeeping missions”, which is often used interchangeably, is defined as “a type of peacekeeping operations of a mediating and monitoring or observation and surveillance nature carried out by a small number of personnel (from a few to several dozen people)” [2, p. 71]. The term “mission” in political-military terminology is reserved for activities undertaken to resolve conflicts and maintain peace.

UN peacekeeping operations were initiated during the term of Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld. The first peacekeeping operation using military contingents was the 1956 UNEF mission, carried out in the effect of the so-called Suez Crisis. However, as D. Hammarskjöld pointed out, the UN activities during the so-called Cold War consisted only of “quieting conflicts”, in the form of consultations or conference diplomacy [32, p. 337].

The Cold War period is also associated with the enactment of the most vital pieces of international law on diplomacy since the Congress of Vienna.

On April 18, 1961, the most important legal act in diplomacy, the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, created by the International Law Commission at the UN, was signed. It entered into force three years later, on April 24, 1964. The Convention, despite the unification of diplomatic rules and procedures, allowed for the respect of existing customs in the case of diplomatic issues not regulated by law.

Although, as has been shown, diplomatic law began to develop much earlier. It was based mainly on custom and the experience of states acquired through it, which were only later codified in normative acts.

The intensive development of multilateral diplomacy in the Cold War period (primarily as part of the establishment of successive international organizations) determined the increased need to introduce norms of international law, formally (and not only in customary form) regulating its specific issues. The international community formalized it in the Vienna Convention of May 23, 1969, on the Law of International Contracts relating directly to multilateral diplomacy.

At that time, new conventions were also enacted to normalize multilateral diplomatic relations, which concerned relations between states and international organizations. These include:

- agreements establishing international organizations,
- agreements establishing the seats and legal status of those organizations,
- conventions systematizing the scope of privileges and immunities of specialized organizations, and the security of United Nations personnel [17, p. 22].

Another act of international law adopted in diplomacy in that period is the Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Cooperation between States, adopted on October 24, 1970, which defines the obligations of the participants in international relations [17, p. 19]. It states that international cooperation should be based on activities aimed at maintaining security and peace, respect for human rights, and eliminating discrimination on all grounds (e.g., religious, racial). Furthermore, activities in the sphere of international relations should follow the principle of equality and non-interference externally and should be done in cooperation with the UN [17, p. 20].

The third of the major successes of international cooperation in the analyzed period was establishing the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) under the so-called Final Act in 1975 in Helsinki. The idea behind it was the Warsaw Pact countries' initiative to convene a conference of all European states to establish a dialogue on the common security of Europe, regardless of whether they belonged to the Western or Eastern political bloc. Those efforts proved successful in 1975, allowing a kind of "relaxation" of relations between the US and the USSR. The CSCE main principles were the peaceful settlement of international disputes with the renunciation of the use of force, the inviolability of borders and the territorial integrity of states, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the possibility of creating non-governmental organizations (the so-called Helsinki groups) in the Eastern Bloc states [29, p. 174-179].

In addition to the formation of alliances (including institutional alliances) at the global level, the manifestation of the dynamic growth of the development of the institutionalization of international relations (including in the field of security) was also the emergence of regional organizations. Those were, among others:

- the League of Arab States (founded in 1945),
- the Organization of American States (founded in 1948),
- the Organization of African Unity (founded 1963, renamed African Union in 2002),
- the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (founded 1967).

Non-institutional diplomatic initiatives of the Cold War period include the Non-Aligned Movement, founded in 1961, which integrates states not bound by formal alliances with any of the then-current political blocs (including Yugoslavia and India).

The beginning of the decline of the so-called Cold War (the end of which is conventionally recognized as 1989) can be traced to the deepening economic crisis in the USSR, resulting from the so-called arms race with the United States. As a result of the rivalry between the superpowers (mainly in the military sphere), the scale of defense spending in the USSR significantly exceeded its financial capabilities, which resulted in underfunding in areas such as health care and education. The crisis forced the USSR authorities to introduce reforms aimed at halting the further deepening of economic problems. They were finally implemented in 1985 by the then leader Mikhail Gorbachev in the form of the so-called perestroika, involving the gradual introduction of elements of a free-market economy and the extended autonomy of the Soviet republics. Nevertheless, the crisis continued to deepen, which was confirmed by the subsequent republics' declarations of independence from 1990 (the first to do so was Lithuania, followed by Estonia and Latvia). It eventually led to the dissolution of the USSR on December 26, 1991.

In December 1991, on the initiative of Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus leaders, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) was established by Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus, which signed the so-called Belovezha Accords. Currently (as of November 2020), it consists of 10 former Soviet republics (after the withdrawal of Georgia and Ukraine). Compared to the USSR, a significant difference is that it is an international organization, not a state.

Other critical events related to the end of the analyzed political period were the reunification of Germany in 1990 and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in 1991.

Thus, as can be observed, the late 1980s and early 1990s witnessed a series of events in international relations that constituted a kind of harbinger of new world order, resulting in many changes, including in the field of diplomacy.

2.4. Diplomacy in the post-Cold War period

In the context of the global geopolitical situation, the collapse of the USSR entailed a change in the world's configuration from a bipolar to a unipolar one, centered around a single superpower – the United States. At the same time, that caused a dramatic change in the global security environment, primarily in terms of the source of potential threats. The fact that a single superpower remained in the international arena significantly reduced the risk of a global conflict, while at the same time shifting it to regional conflicts, the escalation of which could also negatively impact regions far beyond the conflict area itself (e.g., conflicts in the Middle East).

The change mentioned above in the geopolitical situation forced individual states (especially those from the former Eastern Bloc) and multilateral diplomacy actors to adapt. In their case, the most significant changes concerned equipping international organizations with new competencies in dispute resolution.

Such a change occurred in the global security organization, namely the UN. In 1992, the then Secretary-General, B. Ghali, in the enacted “Agenda for Peace”, presented the seven types of peacekeeping operations in force since then. They were implemented by the United Nations and defined as “the introduction of a UN presence in a given area, with the consent of all parties concerned, normally involving the engagement of UN military and/or police personnel and often civilian employees” [33, p. 17-18]:

- preventive diplomacy – diplomatic activities aimed at building confidence, establishing facts, and creating an early warning system of events that threaten peace,
- peacemaking – the combination of diplomacy and military action to bring about a settlement,
- peacekeeping – monitoring the terms of cease-fires, implementation of negotiated agreements,
- peace-building – preventing the recurrence of conflict,
- peace enforcement – monitoring the terms of cease-fires, implementing agreements,
- disarmament – enforcing reductions in the number of weapons and enforcing a ban on the expansion of the arms industry,
- sanctions – applying measures that reduce the possibility of strengthening military and economic potential (e.g., blockades, trade bans, embargoes, restrictions on movement) [33, p. 17-18].

In subsequent years, the UN conducted such operations in Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Cambodia, Somalia, and many other countries.

Given the disappearance of the greatest threat to NATO in the Cold War period in the form of a potential attack from Warsaw Pact countries and the transfer of the central territorial nature of the threat to international security to the regional area, the organization had to redefine its strategy thoroughly.

It was reflected in the provisions of NATO's Strategic Concept, adopted in 1991 during the Rome Summit. The new, dominant form of activity for the organization became the newly introduced so-called out-of-area peacekeeping operations. They were those carried out in countries outside the Alliance, where ongoing military action could pose a potential threat also to any NATO member state, and which were not linked to Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, which provides for the collective defense of an attacked Alliance state by the other members. Examples of such measures were NATO's peacekeeping operations in Yugoslavia

and Kosovo. Their implementation undoubtedly had a significant impact on ending military action in the countries mentioned. In 1994, NATO also introduced the Partnership for Peace program, aimed at candidate countries wishing to join the Alliance. Such states took part in peacekeeping operations and, due to their commitment and positive assessment of their activities, were later admitted as members of NATO; these were former Warsaw Pact member states, including Poland. In the context of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, it should be pointed out that for the first and so far only time in history, it was used after the terrorist attack in the United States on September 11, 2001. However, NATO's main path has been a deterrence policy, including through the possession of nuclear arsenals by some of its member states.

The Western European Union, a political and defense organization established in 1954, was also given the power to conduct military action to settle disputes.

The Petersberg Declaration of the WEU Council of Ministers of June 19, 1992, defined three categories of the so-called Petersberg missions:

- humanitarian and rescue,
- peacekeeping,
- tasks of armed forces in crisis management [29, p. 158].

In 1999, their realization was transferred to the European Union, established in 1993, within the European Security and Defense Policy framework and, following the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty in 2007, the Common Security and Defense Policy.

It should be noted that the European Union is an organization primarily concerned with the integration and economic development of its member states. However, security issues were included as the second pillar of its activities (later abolished by the Lisbon Treaty). As can be observed from the analysis of its legal acts, its authorities carry out activities aimed at deepening the degree of its member states' integration, which in the context of diplomacy is aimed at representing them in external relations, primarily through the High Representative for Foreign Policy and Security.

Another international organization established in the 1990s is the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. That happened after the transformation of the former CSCE conference cycle into a permanent international organization. The primary purpose of its activities, namely, monitoring the situation regarding respect for human rights and the peaceful resolution of disputes, has not changed. An undoubted success of the organization was, for example, bringing about the signing of the 2014 Minsk Protocol on the ceasefire in the fighting in eastern Ukraine, triggered by Russian armed aggression.

In the post-Cold War period, a form of non-institutional cooperation also developed in international relations. A new form of international cooperation, never seen before on such a scale, was the declaration of the so-called Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) by the then President of the United States, George W. Bush, after the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, which claimed the lives of around 3 000 people. Within its framework, the so-called coalition of the willing was created to fight terrorism militarily in the Middle East [34, p. 249].

During that period, the effective diplomatic activities of the international community as a mediator in armed conflicts also led to the conclusion of a truce between, among others, Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (Oslo Agreement of 1993), a truce ending the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Dayton Agreement of 1995) and between Russia and Georgia (in 2008), as well as the afore-mentioned Russia and Ukraine (in 2014).

The diplomatic outcomes of the post-Cold War period, which are relevant in the context of international security, include the following acts of international law:

- the 1990 Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) (in terms of the reduction of conventional forces by its parties),
- the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE-1A) of 1992 (as regards the reduction of conventional forces by its parties),
- the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties (START I) of 1991 between the US and the USSR, START II of 1993 between the US and the Russian Federation (which did not enter into force due to the refusal of the Russian side to ratify it) and New START of 2010 between the US and the Russian Federation on measures to further reduce and limit strategic armaments,
- the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention,
- the 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Conclusions

As shown in the selected examples, from the very beginnings of statehood, diplomacy has not only served as one of the tools for creating foreign policy. However, it has also, to a large extent, determined the shape of international relations and significantly influenced international security. In its context, it is one of the most frequently used means of preventing or ending armed conflicts (e.g., during mediations or negotiations) and maintaining international stability.

The main subjects of diplomacy are states that cooperate in bilateral or multilateral forms, including within international organizations. The activities are carried out both by diplomatic representatives (e.g., ambassadors or consuls) and the governments of individual states. It should be noted that the dynamics of change in the international security environment (especially after the collapse of the bipolar world order) forces the global community to constantly seek new methods and means of ensuring security, as exemplified by the changes in the functioning of the UN and NATO after the end of the so-called Cold War. That is particularly important in a period of progressing globalization and increasing interdependence of states, when their development on the international arena is, in contemporary conditions, is in principle possible only through the conclusion of alliances and agreements.

The most crucial moments in the history of the world diplomacy development in the context of international security are the Congress of Vienna, the development of multilateral diplomacy in the form of the intensive establishment of regional, sub-regional, and global international organizations, and the creation of many security-relevant international legal acts in the Cold War period, as well as institutional changes in international organizations (e.g., NATO) and the successes of the international community in resolving armed conflicts (e.g., in Yugoslavia) in the post-Cold War period.

International relations have undergone constant reforms over time, as they have the nature of a process. The events analyzed in this article, and the consequences that resulted from them, have established the current international order and the nature of diplomacy.

However, the effectiveness of diplomatic activity has been, is, and will be ensured only when states and international organizations cooperate closely in mutual respect for each other's interests and respect the principles of international law, which form the basis of activity in international relations, including security.

Acknowledgement

The paper was written within the framework of the research project No. 146/WNB/65/DzS – Migration policy of the Republic of Poland as a determinant of its internal security, realized in 2020 at the Faculty of Security Sciences of the General Tadeusz Kościuszko Military University of Land Forces.

Conflict of interests

The author declared no conflict of interests.

Author contributions

The author contributed to the interpretation of results and writing of the paper. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethical statement

The research complies with all national and international ethical requirements.

ORCID

Martyna KroczaK  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3153-2053>

References

1. Zięba R. *Pozimnowojenny paradygmat bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego*. In: Zięba R (ed.). *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe po zimnej wojnie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne; 2008, p. 15-42.
2. Zdrodowski B (ed.). *Słownik terminów z zakresu bezpieczeństwa narodowego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Obrony Narodowej; 2008.
3. Kitler W. *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe RP. Podstawowe kategorie uwarunkowania systemu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Obrony Narodowej; 2011.
4. Rana KS. *Bilateral diplomacy: a practitioner perspective*. Policy Papers and Briefs. 2020;15(November):1-16.
5. Zięba R. *Instytucjonalizacja bezpieczeństwa europejskiego. Koncepcje – struktury – funkcjonowanie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR; 2004.
6. Czaputowicz J. *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe. Współczesne koncepcje*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN; 2012.
7. Łoś-Nowak T. *Stosunki międzynarodowe. Teorie – systemy – uczestnicy*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego; 2006.
8. Wróblewski R. *Wprowadzenie do nauk o bezpieczeństwie*. Siedlce: Uniwersytet Przyrodniczo-Humanistyczny w Siedlcach; 2017.
9. Kuźniar R. *Ewolucja problemu bezpieczeństwa – rys historyczny*. In: Kuźniar R, Balcerowicz B, Bieńczyk-Missala A, Grzebyk P, et al. *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar; 2012, p. 18-37.
10. Balcerowicz B. *Procesy międzynarodowe. Tendencje, megatrendy*. In: Kuźniar R, Balcerowicz B, Bieńczyk-Missala A, Grzebyk P, et al. *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar; 2012, p. 59-79.
11. Wojciuk A. *Bezpieczeństwo w teoriach stosunków międzynarodowych*. In: Kuźniar R, Balcerowicz B, Bieńczyk-Missala A, Grzebyk P, et al. *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar; 2012, p. 190-98.

12. *Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States*. Montevideo, 26 December 1933, [online]. Available at: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam03.asp [Accessed: 15 June 2020].
13. Kupiecki R. *Dyplomacja obronna próba konceptualizacji*. *Dyplomacja i bezpieczeństwo*. 2016;1(4): 17-32.
14. Drab L. *Dyplomacja obronna w procesie kształtowania bezpieczeństwa RP*. Warszawa: Difin; 2018.
15. Charillon F, Balzacq T, Ramel F. *Defense Diplomacy*. In: Balzacq T, Charillon F, Ramel F, Snow W (eds.). *Global Diplomacy An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan; 2020, p. 267-78.
16. Sutor J. *Leksykon dyplomatyczny*. Warszawa: Elipsa Dom Wydawniczy; 2005.
17. Ciupiński A. *Dyplomacja wielostronna*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Obrony Narodowej; 2003.
18. Zenderowski R, Krycki M. *Dyplomacja publiczna diaspor. Przyczynek do rozważań*. *Uniwersyteckie Czasopismo Socjologiczne*. 2014;9:17-39.
19. Braniewicz OE. *Znaczenie dyplomacji w regulacji stosunków międzynarodowych oraz kształtowaniu bezpieczeństwa globalnego*. *Kortowski Przegląd Prawniczy*. 2017;3:6-10.
20. Miłosz S. *Dyplomacja współczesna i protokół dyplomatyczny. Teoria i praktyka*. Warszawa: Wojskowe Centrum Edukacji Obywatelskiej; 2010.
21. Konstytucja Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z dnia 2 kwietnia 1997 r. (Dz. U. z 1997 r. Nr 78, poz. 483).
22. Barcik J. *Dyplomacja w systemie bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Oficerskiej Wojsk Łądowych; 2014.
23. Stagnell A. *Diplomacy and Ideology. From the French Revolution to the Digital Age Diplomacy and Ideology*. London: Routledge; 2020.
24. Katz-Suchy J. *Zarys historii dyplomacji*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna; 1966.
25. Sutor J. *Pokojuowe załatwianie sporów międzynarodowych*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich; 1979.
26. Nye JS. *Konflikty międzynarodowe. Wprowadzenie do teorii i historii*. Madej M (transl.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne; 2009.
27. Marcinko M. *Główne założenia i zasady Międzynarodowego Prawa Humanitarnego Konfliktów Zbrojnych*. In: Falkowski Z (ed.). *Międzynarodowe Prawo Humanitarne Konfliktów Zbrojnych materiał szkoleniowy dla szeregowych*. Warszawa: Wojskowe Centrum Edukacji Obywatelskiej; 2013, p. 17-45.
28. Ociepka B. *Dyplomacja publiczna – oksymoron?* In: Stepińska A, Jurga-Wosik E, Secler B (eds.). *Oblicza współczesnej komunikacji. Konteksty – problemy – wyzwania*. Poznań: Polskie Towarzystwo Komunikacji Społecznej; 2018, p. 19-30.
29. Żurawski vel Grajewski P. *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe. Wymiar militarny*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN; 2012.
30. Osmańczyk EJ. *Encyklopedia ONZ i stosunków międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna; 1982.
31. Karta Narodów Zjednoczonych, Statut Międzynarodowego Trybunału Sprawiedliwości i Porozumienie ustanawiające Komisję Przygotowawczą Narodów Zjednoczonych (Dz. U. 1947 Nr 23, poz. 90).
32. Musioł M. *Operacje pokojowe i dyplomacja prewencyjna oraz ich podstawy w polityce zewnętrznej UE w XXI wieku*. *Rocznik Bezpieczeństwa Międzynarodowego*. 2013;7:337-56.
33. Marcinkowski C. *Istota i ewolucja misji pokojowych ONZ*. In: Marszałek M, Zuziak J (eds.). *Wojsko Polskie w międzynarodowych misjach i operacjach pokojowych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Obrony Narodowej; 2010.
34. Madej M. *Międzynarodowa walka z terroryzmem*. In: Kuźniar R, Balcerowicz B, Bieńczyk-Missala A, Grzebyk P, et al. *Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar; 2012, p. 240-58.

Biographical note

Martyna Kroczak – a graduate of the General Tadeusz Kościuszko Military University of Land Forces, she majored in National Security. Winner of the Dean's Award of the Faculty of Security Studies at the Military University of Land Forces for the academic year 2019/2020. Member of the Scientific Circle of Counter Terrorist Security.

Dyplomacja w kontekście bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego – retrospekcja i współczesność

STRESZCZENIE

Celem badań prowadzonych na potrzeby artykułu była eksploracja rozwoju dyplomacji (stanowiącej przedmiot badań) na przestrzeni lat w kontekście jej wpływu na bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe.

W artykule dokonano charakterystyki pojęcia dyplomacji oraz eksploracji jej rozwoju wraz ze wskazaniem przykładów podejmowanych z jej wykorzystaniem przez społeczność międzynarodową działań w obszarze bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego.

Jako metodę badawczą wykorzystano analizę polskich i zagranicznych źródeł literaturowych oraz aktów prawa krajowego i międzynarodowego, z zastosowaniem techniki analizy treści.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE dyplomacja, bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe, stosunki międzynarodowe, organizacje międzynarodowe

How to cite this paper

Kroczak M. *Diplomacy in the context of international security – retrospection and present day*. Scientific Journal of the Military University of Land Forces. 2022;54;4(206):591-608. DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0016.1766.



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>