PHILOSOPHY OF DIPLOMACY

With special reference to the anti-diplomacy of the postmodern and unipolar world

"Only within a certain conception of truth is a stronghold of its existence".
Hegel, *Phenomenology of the Spirit*

"Any knowledge requires a concept, regardless,
the imperfections or the ambiguity of the same".
Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*

Key words

*diplomacy, philosophy of
diplomacy, international
relations*

Author

Dr Emil Vlajki is Professor
Emeritus of the University of
Banja Luka and distinguished
scientist in the field of
Political Science,
International Relations,
Communications and
Philosophy

Correspondence

vemil@teol.net

Field

International relations

DOI

10.5937/pol1612037V

UDC

327:321.01

Paper received on

13.09.2016.

Paper accepted for publishing on

27.11.2016.

Summary

Diplomacy is treated, generally (and wrongly), as just a skill, profession and / or a trade. It is a systematization of what, apparently, happens in practice and, partially, the means and manner of operation of diplomatic activities in theory and practice of international relations. Profound understanding of diplomacy is partly delivered through ethics and activities. However, these ethics are presented in its metaphysical form and, as such, have a unilateral, non-dynamic and non-dialectical Manichaeian meaning. For example, peace is something that is good and moral, violence and the like are evil therefor try(ing) to keep the peace is positive, and so on. Things are very different when viewed through the dialectics of history that knows no common morality. The formation and disappearance of nations and civilizations has its roots in terms of history. Violence is often shown as a necessity and is necessity - immoral? Diplomacy, based (metaphorically) on the 'Words', has its roots in the Bible itself and therefore in theory, is a constitutive part of the philosophy of history. In regards to diplomacy, this paper ponder the terms of: the totality, of its Spirit, the Truth, of necessity, freedom, dialectic, postmodernism, neo-liberalism and a hint of the future, historically more humane society.

This paper conceptually considers dialectic of two organically related things to attempts of founding of philosophy of diplomacy:

Very briefly, we will look back, more in the form of introductory remarks for the second part of this study on the craft of diplomacy. Negotiations, among many others are its professional and most important part. Defined as 'Bargaining', ('Pourparlaires' - fr.) by interested and/or opposing forces of a disputed issue. Encyclopedia Britannica clearly points out this moment of negotiations: "diplomacy: The established method of influencing decisions and behaviors of foreign governments and people through dialogue, negotiations and other measures short of war or violence". In the same context, mediation and conciliation could be added to the negotiations as related and / or complementary diplomatic activities. Finally, it still comes down to negotiations (multilateral and gradual).

Complementary to this is the imposition of solution by force to markedly weaker side, in quasi (farcical) negotiations. That is anti-diplomacy which could even be called the 'repressive diplomacy'.

More elaborated will be the position that reviewing the professional/craft part of diplomacy is incomplete without understanding its philosophical and historical dimensions that apply to all epochs of humanity.

Here we will, just by way of illustration, refer to the current neo-liberal and post-modern world. It consists of anti-diplomatic activities - violence done by the West against a much weaker side - the developing countries with reference to ontological side of such treatments.

Note: By our considerations, diplomacy is inseparable from the international relations, but can be (methodologically and ontologically) self-treated¹.

1. Few references of professional and contextual dimension of negotiations and imposition

Due to the already existing enormous number of fundamental and elaborate studies regarding this topic, something truly new in this field may not be given. Let us just turn briefly at the professional and contextual understanding of the diplomatic negotiations.

Typically, specified kind of diplomacy (negotiations) works if there is some kind of balance of power between the negotiating parties that are interested,

¹ Here are some definitions of diplomacy that are related to our remark: **a.** Diplomacy is the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct formal relations between governments of independent states, in. Chas. W. Freeman, *The Diplomat's Dictionary*, Unated States Institute for Peace Press, Washington, 1997., 70. **b.** According to Berige, diplomacy is management of international relations more through negotiations than by force, propaganda or application of the law, in. G. R. Beridge, *Diplomacy, Theory and Practice*, London-New York-Munich, 1995. **c.** Hamilton and Langorn claim that: core business of diplomacy is a advocacy, respectively - one of the higher forms of persuasion, in. Keith Hamilton and Rixhard Langhorne, *The Practice of Diplomacy, Its Evolution, Theory and Administration*, London - New York 1995, 154. **d.** Barston, however, believes that "diplomacy is related to the management of relations between states and between states and other actors" and construed as referring to "consultation, formulation and implementation of foreign policy" , in. P. Barston, *Modern Diplomacy* London, 1996., I.

and / or conflicting, about an issue. Of course, during the negotiations, either party may resort to bluffing, threats, blackmail, and the like, so it is up to the opposing side to expose such practice and match it as long as both parties are equal in strength, power, influence, external support etc.

Although, when some of the parties have no capacity for true negotiations it must submit to the stronger side. Meaning that regardless of the formal proclaimed equivalence of each other - essentially there is no diplomacy. However, even such quasi and / or anti-diplomacy fits the postmodern dialectic processes, just as it fitted the repressive processes in the earlier stages of humanity development.

The latter, the anti-diplomatic behavior, has its limits. Objectively, a powerless party may refuse farcical, "diplomatic" humiliation and force. Examples are the Austro-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia' prior to the First World War or by Gandhi's passive resistance in opposing superior side, aware that in such conflict it is likely to suffer huge losses and maybe defeat itself.

The new "invention" of unipolar world (though such practices existed in earlier periods), is the so-called "preventive diplomacy". Boutros Boutros-Ghali defines it: "Preventive diplomacy is action to prevent the outbreak of disputes between the parties, to prevent existing disputes to grow into the conflict and to restrict expansion of the latter when it already breaks out"².

In fact, the Euro-Atlantic world has used this phrase against their anti-liberal opponents and against peoples and

territories that were supposed to be conquered and occupied (Serbia, Iraq).

Of interest is also a manipulative term known as "public diplomacy". This is a term introduced by career diplomat Edmund Gullion, back in 1965, and denotes gradual transfer of the culture from one country to another in order for meeting together. Unipolar postmodernism made sure that the Anglo-Saxon culture (English language, celebrations/holidays, Hollywood production, instant food, etc.), effectively extends by "soft diplomacy", to all the countries of the world.

After these remarks that separate diplomatic from farcical and anti-diplomatic, we can assert that anti-diplomacy includes in itself the power, arrogance, frauds and cynicism that threatens the weaker party thereby cannot compete. Leading to the master party to dominate absolutely over much weaker side.

Although in certain periods of history unipolar world becomes overcome, as is the case now with the decline of American supremacy, it does not mean that it is useless to have a knowledge about the characteristics of non-diplomatic international relations that are based on violence.

In fact, there is no single period of history where unipolarity characteristics were absent. For example, in a bipolar / multipolar world, there are spheres of interest of the great powers and such areas are certainly, in its essential characteristics - unipolar.

Therefore, the formal diplomatic activity regarding disputes between the ruling and servile is most commonly an anti-diplomatic farce.

² Lutovinov, V. I. – Morozov, Y. B., *Conflict Prevention and Settlement with Peacekeeping Forces*, 2000, www.findarticles.com/cf.

Let us say that the modern, unipolar, anti-diplomacy is not and cannot be separated from the social totality to which it belongs. On the contrary, it would not be able, as before, to function without the other parts of the system - claims B. H. M. Vlekke³. Here is how concretely we can present the parts of the social Whole and it is Spirit still dominated by Euro-Atlantic West led by the US in relation to the developing countries.

-Diplomats, including the special envoys, become important, repressive factor "of a new totalitarian society". They perform repression, blackmail and trickery. For example, they give a "green light" to leaders of the poor nation to take some action, and then charge them for what they have done. Later on that basis they military intervene (Iraq in 1991, Yugoslavia in 1998.). Madeleine Albright, US Secretary of State, bragged that during the conference in Rambouillet (1998-1999.) set such conditions to Yugoslavia, such ultimatum which no country in the world could accept (practically proposed occupation of Yugoslavia in order to allegedly preserve peace). When rejected, US-NATO militarily intervene⁴.

-Humanitarian organizations in wartime are far more concerned with the active support for one of the parties in the conflict and espionage rather than their proclaimed activities (for example, the

case of one of the world's largest organization 'CARE').

-Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) more than 1,400 registered just in UN office in Geneva. Their majority works closely with diplomatic missions and act as intelligence tentacles of the West. Both in war and in peace they are involved in all sort of activities⁵. That was presented by Germany based "Organization for the practical implementation of Christian charity", who supplied weapons to Croatia - one of the warring factions in Yugoslavian conflict in the early nineties⁶. Likewise, a French NGO, in the next period, via Croatia supplied weapons to the Bosnian Muslims⁷.

NGOs are not only engaged in espionage and weapons smuggling, but also in destabilizing regimes (for example "orange revolution" in Ukraine), as well as organizing prostitution. In West Africa (Liberia, Guinea, Sierra Leone), about forty NGOs were implicated in exploitation of children in refugee camps⁸.

Some international institutions such as, for example, 'World Bank', integrate high NGO personnel in its ranks⁹.

Remark. Not all NGOs fall into the same basket. Many of them, as well as their members, are doing an honest and useful work. Thus, such organizations do not have large funds. On the other hand, organizations directly funded by the West, especially from the United States,

³ B. H. M. Vlekke, *Politique etrangere*, 1962., vol. 27, pp. 230-245., www.persee.fr/doc/polit_0032-342x_1962_num_27_3_2346, also see: *The Sociology of Diplomacy: A General Outline with Some Aspects and Dilemmas*, MILAN JAZBEC, *Perspectives*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (2013), pp. 87-108.

⁴ Barriot Patric, *Les diables sont déchaînés*, L'Age d'Homme, 2000, p.180-181.

⁵ Blum W., *L'État voyou*, Parangon, 2001., p.278.

⁶ Collon M., *Pokeur menteur*, EPO, Bruxelles, p. 61.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 314.

⁸ "Sunday Morning Herald", 27 février 2002.

⁹ Ziegler Jean, *Les nouveaux maîtres du monde*, Fayard, 2002, p.216-217.

honestly do their humanitarian work only when the West has no more interest in certain area/region where that NGO operates. It happens that NGOs even criticize some moves of the West, but this criticism is superficial. It provides the illusion of objectivity particularly during the intensive campaign of demonization of some West victim.

In certain cases, when the truth is impossible to avoid, NGOs (such as Amnesty International) are making a critiques so to blur connections between the West/US and criminal events. Such is the case with 'Death Squads' in Latin America. Finally, when the truth is evidently associated with its main protagonists (West / US) it is presented not as a rule, but as an isolated case. For example, torture of Iraqis in US and British prisons in Iraq after the occupation of that country by the Anglo-Saxon coalition in 2003. Whatever it is, even in cases when such examples do stand out, no one eventually bombs neither the US nor W.Europe because of it. On the other hand, demonized underdeveloped countries are bombed and / or subjected to deadly economic sanctions!

When it comes to media, they follow military and business "humanism" of the dominant unipolar power. For example, you cannot expect from a journalists of an 'NBC TV network to talk about the dangers of nuclear power plants, as long as General Motors (ELECTRIC) 'which is the world largest producer of nuclear power, signs checks' of its journalists¹⁰".

Each time when "international community" invades some country, their mainstream media unconditionally back them. In theory, there are two

explanations for this behavior. First is that these interventions are humanitarian, so fair media must support it. Another explanation is that the Western media automatically support the US-NATO military interventions because they themselves belong to the same totalitarian system.

Along with all of these segments of the social Whole, Intelligence Service that include the journalists, work closely together with services for psychological warfare, local quislings in dominated countries and many other institutions. Such "journalistic" activity of the CIA in developing countries is well known. In 1975, annual US Senate committee, while investigating CIA activities, discovered that foreign media was used for covert operations by the latter¹¹. Frequent actions of the CIA, were fabrication and distribution of false (flag) news around the world. The victims of these and similar activities were progressive regimes and movements in Chile, Vietnam, Nicaragua, Peru, El Salvador, etc.

During American interventions, major media companies directly link with military complex. Thus, during the NATO attack on Yugoslavia, the Pentagon had his office in CNN¹². In the same context, many scientific studies have shown farce nature of diplomatic initiatives for peace. That also include secret services, alleged journalists who win Pulitzer Prize for lying about the situation on the ground, domestic quislings, along with the

¹¹ See: Horrock, N.M., CIA-Ties to Journalists, The, New York Times, 28/01/1976

¹² Tacheau Jean-François, Stratégie d'expansion du nouvel empire global, L'Age d'Homme, 2001, p.96.

¹⁰ Carl Jensen, What Free Press, in Peter Phillips, Censored 2000, p. 183.

assistance of international political and financial institutions.

Overall, postmodern diplomacy of unilateral world could not work in isolation from other social and repressive parts of the system or the core of neoliberal goals. This said, in the IMF there are (without the quotes) economic diplomats-killers. For example, if a head of some developing countries refuses IMF services, sometimes these diplomats organize killings of such persons. These die in following period in arranged accidents¹³.

¹³ John Perkins, *Confessions of an Economic Hit Men*, 2004. The Interview:

Question: *In numerous interviews since the appearance of the book "Confessions of an Economic Hit Man", saying that the people who worked as an economic killer created the first truly global empire.*

Answer: *Yes, exactly, the first global empire that was created without primary involvement of the army. We have worked in many different ways. First, if the identified third-world country that possesses the resources that are crucial, as is oil, we would approach with the ambition for a country to borrow from the IMF and World Bank, its sister organization. Money would never actually reach that country directly but go to large corporations – implementers of the major infrastructure projects, such as power plants, roads, industrial installations. The money which the country borrows, as a rule, goes from one side to the several families in the country.*

At the same time, the country is burdened with debt that they can not repay. This is „our“ moment, one that we waited and counted on. We return to that country and say "because you can not return the debts, you will, per price we set (and that is usually very low price, in no way reflects the market), sell to our companies your natural and mineral resources, oil, water, along most profitable companies. Then we exploit them without having to respect any laws to protect the environment. We do not allow the work of these companies conditioned

After this, with a great degree of cynicism we have to remember the Prussian Emperor Friedrich the Great and his sayings: "Diplomacy without arms is like music without instruments." We have listed these random examples of the use of force in international relations and there are infinitely more of enticing ones. Nevertheless, with their further stating we would not improve in any way the quality of the study. To us, something else is more important. Since hardly anyone can consider a violent conflict resolution justifiable, we will try, among other considerations related to diplomatic activity, to see if there is any historical reasoning for such manner of conduct.

2. Philosophically - historical dimension

After briefly reviewing the, so sold, professional aspect of what the essence of diplomacy is - negotiations by approximately tied parties and contrary to that (but also complementary), consideration of the reflection of the anti-diplomacy as the imposition of attitudes and solutions by force on weaker party, often in guise form of formal diplomatic

on any environmental regulatory restrictions. Also, let us make a military base in your territory. "

Pushing countries into debts, debt slavery, allows the system that operates under the following scheme: first act of economic „hit men“; if we fail to recruit heads of government or state for our goals, on stage will be called "the jackals" - people in charge of overthrowing affairs of governments or individuals. Jackals also kill leaders of the countries we want to penetrate with the ambition of taking over their natural resources and wealth, takeover of entire economy.

(John Perkins "Economic killer global empire", 23/10/2010. The interview, by Biljana Đorović)

negotiations, we can now move to the understanding of these activities as part of the 'Cunning 'ind' ('Mind', 'Spirit', 'Idea', 'Self-consciousness' - Hegel) and its self-development¹⁴.

Note: For fairness, we will speak of the historical course of Western civilization that claims to be universal torchbearer and the main subject of development of humankind, something that other civilizations negate. However, according to the author of this article, steady progress of rationality, the concept and practice of the West, is indeed the fate of humanity. This applies particularly to scientific determinism in the natural sciences, without which humankind would soon become extinct.

In other words, this paper will discuss (the) reality of diplomacy in the context of the sense of history. For which one can essentially say that self-development of the "ratio" which constant is the progress of science and technology as it unfolds in dialectical stages. Each stage has its own paradigm (thesis) that works well until the moment it begins to be overcome by advanced paradigm that explains and provides solutions to fundamental contradictions caused by the ruling paradigm. Of course, more advanced paradigm that historically begins to impose, is still in its infancy (antithesis). It comes down to a battle of old and new. With historical turbulence, because there is no linear denouement, a new paradigm replaces the old (synthesis) and so historical dialectics constantly renew. "Word" as an ontological foundation of diplomacy

¹⁴ This article is based on Hegel's philosophy. In doing so we take into consideration two of his works: „Phenomenology of Spirit“ and „Philosophy of History“.

Nevertheless, phenomenology and dialectic of historicity have their sources. Put it another way - before any serious phenomenological considerations of phenomenon or process, we have to start from the ontology and/or metaphysics of a given phenomenon. Eventually in diplomacy, everything comes down to negotiations, making it quite clear that the basis of this phenomenon is the 'Word', metaphorically and concretely.

If Hegel based his thought on Greek philosophy, we will base primary ontological unit of diplomacy - "the Word" on the Bible, where we find two important topics for our study:

1. "In the beginning there was a Word"
2. Negotiations between God and man that end in "contract" and "partnership".

The wisdom of Bible, as we anticipate, is immeasurable. It starts from the Genesis, which portrays the evolution of life that concludes with the Man. Such evolutionary flow is not at all different from that of Darwin. Followed by the story of Job that outlines relations of the distrustful, but merciful, Lord and the revolted servant, it ends with outstanding thought of a "Word", which is, speaking Hegelian, at the same time the essence and the manifestation of everything. "Word" symbolically speaking is not only at the beginning, but also in the middle and at the end of what was, what is, and what will be. In the biblical discourse of freedom, the "Word" is the universe, human destiny, eternal, ingenious, passionate and everywhere. "The Word" marked the fate of a man by two revealed, today dominating, religions: Christianity and Islam.

The Word of God, through Moses, gave humankind the basis of moral behavior.

The phenomenological specified word was foundation of interpersonal relations and whose violation was inconceivable for millennia. Theoretically, Machiavelli gave a radical reversal of such attitude, especially important for the diplomatic activity. He noted that specified word could be violated if it is in the interest of the rulers¹⁵. "Word" is, in the special situations, a synonym for diplomacy. It is said that, "the Word" replaced a weapon", at the same time, it is the most powerful weapon. "Word", to carry out diplomatic activities, has to be meaningful, subtle, functional, timely and the like. However, with true meaning only when the entire diplomatic process is within the spirit of human progress. Beyond that, it can be helpful, but this usefulness can be manipulative, rough, simple and ephemeral, and on the other hand - empty, mere waste of time.

2. "Alliance" (Hebrew: 'Berit') sometimes occurs by agreement (i.e. the negotiations), and sometimes by mere acceptance of God's will. It is the central concept of the whole of Scripture.

¹⁵ Of extreme importance is the fact that the world was built by the Word and that the foundation of overall reality is the Word. If it means openness, focus and orientation toward each other, to you, then the reality, which is also based on the Word, carries essential points within self. The reality in itself faces another and „the Other“ completely. It is open in itself and as such, waits to receive a response outside itself. In addition, the reality is essentially interpellation, speech that expects the response so a relation transfers into a conversation. *Bozo Lujčić The Power of Biblical Words*, 07.09.2014., www.svjetlorijeci.ba/clanak/1745/vjera-i.../snaga-biblijske-rijeci

'Berit' of God "Jehovah" with people is a theme that unites and develops the entire Bible and attributes Moses as the only mediator of Alliance and publication of the Law on Mount Sinai¹⁶.

Although we will not deal with that aspect because it is not the goal of this study, and given the "word" and negotiation as the fundamental characteristics of diplomacy, we should mention that many authors believe that the theory of communication is just as important for diplomacy, such as diplomacy is important for international relations¹⁷.

When sanctity of the verbal agreement - given word and honor, were replaced by capitalistic principles, Machiavellianism got its full meaning. The principles of market, money and profit impose a general prostitution as normality in sense that things are everything and word is nothing. Thus - the man is a thing like

¹⁶ The Hebrew word used by the biblical writers of the Old Testament for concept of covenant is "be'rit". The etymology of the word is not entirely clear. In the Akkadian language (which is regarded as the mother of all Semitic languages) the noun "Birit" means "chains, a shackles" a proposal "Birit" means "between". The Hebrew word - be'rit therefore means: something that connects, interconnect, brings together the two sides of the partnerships. (*Starozavjetni pojam saveza s posebnim osvrtom na ponovljeni zakon* Adalbert Rebić, hrcak.srce.hr/file/77809)

¹⁷ Communication is to diplomacy as blood is to the human body. Whenever communication ceases, the body of international politics, the process of diplomacy, is dead. Result is violent conflict or atrophy. (*Communication: An Essential Aspect of Diplomacy*, Christer Jönsson & Martin Hall, 16 – 16 Prepared for 43rd Annual ISA Convention, New Orleans, LA, March 23-27, 2002; panel WA23: Diplomatic Theory and Practice).

everything else, and this regardless of the historical usefulness for a man and humankind, lasts more than five centuries.

However, history does not stop there. Capitalism (modernism), after completing its historic mission (globalization, rationality, of which, of course, primarily benefited Western civilization), became full of indecipherable contradictions, especially because, within market relations, the development of science and technology has left people out of work. People can be extremely talented in something, but if the market does not need to it, such people could die of hunger. In the broadest social context - society without work creates new class of disposable people¹⁸. This situation is becoming increasingly untenable.

However, we progress into new, still undefined, hopefully more humane, phase that could, at least partially comply with Marx's maxim: work according to abilities and receive according to the needs. However, it only looms timidly.

This stage of self-development of Spirit embodied in the human race, this transition, we call postmodernism. It is irreversibly fraught with used relations that existing social structures and their repressive apparatus defend at all costs. Thus existing ever more repressive institutions, including diplomacy are trying to defend, by any costs, something that sinks into oblivion against the presentiment – a new social relations. The truth of diplomacy beyond the historical totality

Prior to consideration of diplomatic activity in the post-modern light and through the sense of history, let us turn to the first essential step of getting to know

¹⁸ Emil Vlajki, *Patologija uma*, SSOBiH, 1988, vidj odgovarajuće poglavlje: *Društvo bez rada*.

her - to question of its veracity (alternatively: validity), beyond inevitable historical project of a Mind within a specific social context¹⁹. Then we can talk about the good and bad, useful and useless, moral and immoral diplomacy, etc. We must be careful here.

Diplomacy, as it is taught and practiced and as already stressed at the beginning of this study, is only a tool and nothing more, even when it scores, seemingly, great things.

The following few examples suggest the splendor and misery of diplomacy. The starting point is the principle that its craft, the factual part, gets its veracity only within the Spirit and the Whole of the social totality wherein it operates.

Before we go into any further discussion, let us consider three degrees of truthfulness of diplomacy (TD):

TD according to professional standards (not considered);

Whole determines the TD - political economic, social, chronology of events, the balance of power of the participants, concrete diplomatic activities, and the

¹⁹ The truth is "the Whole", says Hegel. That "Whole" is exactly such/true, because it has its own Spirit. This means that facts are just facts. They may be correct, but not true because, again, they get their truthfulness only within a Whole - managed and arranged by certain Spirit. So parts of that Whole may be diverse, but related in Spirit and act as one within the function of that Spirit. In other words, media, diplomacy, police, administration, etc, (some of the embodiments), must comply with the Spirit of a given Whole. The parts are, therefore, objective when they are "biased" and as such allow the life of the Whole. The disintegration of the system (a Whole, totality) begins when parts of the Whole begin to act as a function of another Spirit, of a different Whole.

whole Spirit in which this activity is going on. That is, the overall atmosphere of concrete diplomatic events, false diplomatic activity of one or more parties that covers something else - the (un) foreseeability of the consequences of these (and the like) actions;

Review of concrete diplomatic activities in the spirit of the philosophy of history in relation to the dialectical moment that determines the meaning of the diplomatic event. Let us illustrate our second point with a few examples.

- Diplomatic and other various means of achievements, seemingly very significant, can be considered far from any greatness. For example, who today can claim that the Treaty of Versailles had some historical significance? In a sense of shifting history toward progress. How much energy was spent on the implementation of this agreement that resulted in untold hardships for countries and peoples!

- In Diplomacy there's often lack of understanding of what is truly accomplished as it's done technically correct. Example is Hitler's totalitarian Nazism that took fifty million lives and had no historical significance. It was only a small bayou that led nowhere. Nonetheless, the diplomats of democratic (and decadent) Europe and of then the isolationist US generally oversaw that. They are responsible for the millions of victims of casualties in World War II. So for example, British diplomat (Prime minister) Chamberlain proudly touted with an agreement with Hitler that gave away Czechoslovakia to Nazism. This was done

to ensure world peace²⁰. For Hitler, the diplomatic process was pure farce, in order buy the time to invade Poland.

²⁰ The Munich agreement - separation of the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia. Concluded on September 30. 1938. in Munich by the British and French Prime Ministers N. Chamberlain and É. Daladier with Hitler A. and B. Mussolini. Only few weeks after the occupation of Austria in March 1938. (The "Anschluss"), Hitler opened a new crisis (Sudeten crisis). He demanded that the Sudeten (Sudetenland) in Czechoslovakia, where German minority lived, is annexed by 3rd Reich, openly threatening war if contrary. He referred to the fact that by creation of Czechoslovakia Sudeten Germans were denied of their self-determinations to join Germany. At the same time, the French and especially the British governments were unprepared for war. They decided on policy of appeasement and kept downward pressure on Czechoslovakia (Runciman mission) to give up to Hitler, "in order to avoid a war." In negotiations with Hitler in September 1938 Czechoslovakia demanded assurances that in the separation, force will not be used and that there will be no further territorial claims their account. By Munich agreement Czechoslovakia lost about 29,000 square kilometers of its territory and 3.6 million inhabitants (25%). Without the fight she had to surrender their strong fortifications toward Germany, lose about 66% of coal, 70% of the iron and steel industry, 90% of industry of porcelain, about 80% of coal and 80% of chemical industry. Then began the disintegration of the country by rising questions of the independence of Slovakia that followed in March 1939. Germany then occupied its remaining parts. The Munich Agreement was completed audit of the Versailles Treaty and finally achieved great German unification. However, Hitler's expansion ambitions meant that the Munich agreement was not the end of an aggressive foreign policy, rather than an introduction to World War 2.

- Examples of abuse of diplomacy by other means are also not infrequent. For example: in cooperation with the United States, in August 1995, Croatian President Tudjman called the Geneva delegation of Serb Krajina to the peace negotiations. While the Serb delegation traveled, Krajina was attacked and conquered.

- In practice a majority of agreements are never implemented and serve more as a break for parties of the conflict prior to resuming of hostilities. In this regard, let us remember numerous agreements between Jews and Palestinians in the Middle East. Worse example of these agreements is when only one side has benefits as it is, for example the case of the Brussels agreements reached between the losing Serbs and the Kosovo Albanians.

-History puts everything in its place, no matter what we thought at some point. Say a great idea as Non-Aligned Movement (and all appropriate diplomatic activities that took place at the world level for decades), turned out to be out of breath and without any impact on humanity. Because it is not human to be non-aligned, but the opposite.

At the same time, neo-liberalism, (that will be discussed later in the paper) is historically at its sunset, but it is still far from being defeated. It will inflict a lot of evil before it vanishes from the world stage. Upon considering there, and a number of similar diplomatic "non-accomplishments," The Mind smiles courteously with its void grin - to paraphrase the philosopher Rosenzweig.

The truth of (anti) diplomacy, violence and history²¹

The historic and non-historic.

So far, we have discussed some issues of truthfulness of the moment in which some diplomatic activity takes place. It is determined by the specific social Whole and its Spirit, but not the sense of history. The Next step is to understand its historical veracity. But, above all, we need to make a distinction between different categories of international relations and adequate diplomatic efforts.

Certain types of international relations have no major importance for the gait of history. For example, when great Western powers fight each other, it can only have something to do with the will for power. Nonetheless, the historicity does not change significantly, so corresponding diplomatic relations do not mean much more. The essence of the First World War was, in fact, that Germany climbed to the world scene too late and wanted a redistribution of colonies. In its calculations it entwined Italy and Austro-Hungary. The Second World War was the result of populist madness of one person. He took advantage of the global economic crisis to come to power and profited from decadence of other Western powers to, at

²¹ We have two works in mind that underpin this part of the text. The first is "The role of force in history" by F. Engels, and the other is "Humanism and terror by M. Merlau-Ponty". Both works justify historic violence relying on Hegel's dialectic. Engels justifies violence when crossing from one socio-economic epoch to another (i.e., the bourgeois revolution that toppled feudalism). Remark Merlau-Ponty justifies Stalinism in the name of preservation of communism but subsequently has denied exposed positions.

least temporarily, impose himself worldwide.

After all, Nazism as a racist theory is an historical step backwards and had not much chance to succeed. Competition of Euro-Atlantic and European socialist bloc (as well as the current Russia), has nothing to do with historical progress. The only, minor, effect is that an arms race accelerates the progress of science and technology, but certainly that progress would take place anyway.

Nor the current emergence of other great powers such as China and India changes things. While the "major powers", despite all their mutual confrontations, thanks to (and) diplomatic efforts, manage well, in that time, several billion people in the world suffer from lack of food and water. Evident is the lack of almost all types of modern communications, debt bondage along with mutual conflicts pushed by the 'great ones' and so on.

In parallel, the "successful" part of the world sits comfortably in their armchairs and observes death, misery and wars of "primitives" and "savages", including those in the Balkans.

Every year a real genocide, in developing countries, takes place before our eyes, with tens of millions dying.

Alarming. At the time of this writing, the United Nations say that the worst humanitarian crises in the world, since 1945. Is taking place. Twenty (20) million people currently are starving. This is neoliberalism in practice, but its diplomats held many (secret) meetings on the theme how to reduce the world's population. Of course in the underdeveloped countries.²²

²² The theory of overpopulation is very popular not only in the US, but throughout the West. Lately, it has the character of a mass psychosis. It is said that the Earth can feed up to 10

To be more specific, a good deal of diplomatic activity of the developed world produces misfortune and crimes in the developing world. Let us remember who toppled Yugoslavia, who initiated the war in Bosnia. What is the result of works of all High representatives (also diplomats) in the protectorate of Bosnia and Herzegovina, besides disenfranchising of Serbs?

One of them, Lord Paddy Ashdown, "a great diplomat" with a more "honorable" profession as an intelligence officer of MI6, supplied the Albanian terrorists with weapons!

Let us ask ourselves why Western diplomats, in this time of rising tensions in

billion people therefore, there is an urgent need to reduce the birth rate in third world countries. In the past 16 years, \$ 75 billion has been invested in implementing this policy. In his book, American political scientist William Engdahl claims that several years ago in Central America, a new vaccine appeared, allegedly against tetanus. Only women of reproductive age, (from 15 to 45 years) were vaccinated. Tests by independent laboratories show that the vaccine contains a substance that reduces the ability of vaccinated to bear children. Author then points out that the same fund financed the creation of genetically modified plants, whose consumption causes infertility (F. W. Engdahl, *Seeds of Destruction*). Similar highlights by Vladimir Cidendambajev, Deputy Director of the Institute of Plant Physiology RAS. According to him, transgenic corn and soy were several times tested on mammals - the rodents. Everywhere with identical results of destroyed liver and kidneys. Also, the possibility of giving birth decline in the third and fourth generation to practically zero. (www.bebamur.com / ...) The broadest concept for the "reasonable" reduction of population is eugenics. It was, in the first third of the 20th century introduced in the United States, and then by Nazi Germany.

the Balkans, are trying to create a third Albanian state in Macedonia, etc.? Such diplomatic activities, which are in accordance with neoliberalism, have nothing to do with the progress of history; they are the opposite.

Finally and consequently: It is most important to notice that an historical shift is one that goes in the direction of overcoming certain paradigms that hampers the upcoming radically new stage of human relations. Any other movement within the paradigm is, ultimately, professional and technical, as well as historically - destructive in nature.

Rationality, suffering and progress

And so we return to the sense of history. "The Cunning Mind" is concerned that the development of science and technology (S&T) increases the chance of survival of man and mankind. Thus, it cares little about the suffering that the path of development of self-awareness generate.

This view seems to be that the self-developing Mind, in some of its stages, does not recognize common moral principles.

Things are, historically speaking extremely frustrating in that regard. One can, factually speaking, claim that the "Cunning Mind", in every epoch, sacrifices masses in the favor of progress of rationality. European civilization, including the recent American, for thousands of years dominated, exploited and destroyed other, according to western standards, less rational, "lower class civilizations." Who cares in this time for, example, that white settlers in the current US destroyed millions of Indians to build the modern America? Who cares that West, for hundreds of years and by extremely cruel

manner, exploited slave labor and turned the non-European world into colonies that were plundered for centuries? Who cares that white settlers in Australia destroyed Aborigines in order to create a prosperous country?

We do not stress this by merely moralizing needs.

Certainly, if there were no such conquests, genocides and exploitations, the West would evolve much more slowly! It is said that the basic goal of history is to increase the chances of man and humanities preservation, especially through S&T revolution.

That goal is achieved by following and exploiting in practice Aristotle's formal logic and Hegel's dialectic - therefore pure rationality.

In this paper, we can conclude that the destruction and exploitation of entire civilizations and peoples, which are slowing down and / or stopping progress (as the West defines it), was a historical inevitability. No matter how hard we try to interpret it in different ways, the facts lead us on this single track.

Let us recap. The European, Judeo-Christian civilization, along numerous wanderings, conceptually accepted the formal logic (the ultimate, absolute rationality) as the "nec plus ultra" (Latin "nothing further beyond") of its existence. It has been so from Biblical times to the present day: Judaism, Ancient Greece, Rome, Christianity (St Thomas Aquinas, scholasticism), enlightenment, Hegel, positivism.

This kind of rationality could have been developed by other peoples and civilizations, possibly even better and more fully than in the West. However, upon specific and not racist reasons, the Islamic world and China, were far less developed, inconsistent and / or

underutilized. Despite the fact that sometimes in their discoveries they stood above Europe.

Thus the West gained a huge advantage by developing powerful weapons, ships, rational administration, relations of dominance and everything else necessary for colonization, exploitation and destruction.

It (the West) therefore, solely and consistently implemented the two most important Biblical paragraphs contained in "Genesis": an increase in knowledge and prolonging life.

Suffice it to mention that the Cro-Magnon man lived from 17 to 20 years, and now the average life expectancy in the West is 86 years and rising. Let us mention, in this regard, similar advances in, computer sciences, space exploration, etc.).²³

²³ Much is said of how S&T Revolution (Industry - pollution - the destruction of nature - the ozone hole, nuclear power - A bomb , biotechnology - transgenic crops - growth hormone) are threatening to destroy all of humanity. Problems are clearly serious. But all progress brings with it new uncertainties and dangers. It is true that a civilization based on profit is disregards preservation of nature. However, with the progress of rationality, it is inevitable that nature becomes more adapted for humans and less primeval. All this is calculated in by progress and it is clear that these new problems that threaten human existence, must be urgently addressed. However, one has to return to Marx. He said that the resolution of something begins only when social and economic conditions are created (Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Introduction). In other words, when the danger becomes obvious and ominous for those who control the fate of the world, they will begin to solve the problems. But certainly also hinder the alternative movements. It will not be too late for the

Note: Depending on the viewing angle - the self-developing Mind, despite S&T progress, in many ways is inhumane but also seems to be a necessity and certain historical progress of human relations, cannot be denied. Optimists will say that feudalism was better than slavery and capitalism from feudalism. So it is and also - no. Never have misery, hunger and violence in the world been more conspicuous as in the modern age. German philosopher Horkheimer in his book *Eclipse of the mind*, for instance, says that after Auschwitz humanism is no longer possible.

The current actions of neoliberalism and its diplomacy are criminal²⁴.

survival of humanity, but by then, major and painful casualties and damages will occur.

²⁴ In everyday speech neoliberalism is defined as the rejection of Keynes's ideas of the welfare state and the rise of the Chicago school of political economy - Von Hayek, Friedman and the rest.

Neoliberalism is usually identified with the radical free market - unlimited competition and free trade achieved by deregulation and elimination of customs duties and various monetary and social processes. Thus insensitive to poverty, social dislocation, destruction of culture, long-term depletion of natural resources and environmental destruction. Neoliberalism is often referred in the context of the Third World to describe arrangements like NAFTA that increase the vulnerability of poor nations to the changes caused by globalization or the policies of the World Bank or the IMF. Through the financial packages intended for "restructurings" they manipulate both political institutions and social formations in Third World countries. For progressives, then, neoliberalism is a derogatory term that invokes economic policies that maintain or deepen poverty and subordination of peripheral countries under the dominant nations. It is also compatible

with an authoritarian, despotic, corrupt and paramilitary form of government. Imperialist adventures of the Bush administration in Afghanistan and Iraq, obviously, extensively borrow from the legitimating rhetoric of democracy. Not only are both wars started as "a fight for our way of life" and against the regime who allegedly conceal enemies (terrorists) or danger (WMD) to such a way of life, but both justify violations of national sovereignty with the argument that democracy could, and there should shape. Every nation, supposedly, needs liberation from the brutal and despotic rule. A standard left critique of the first justification is that "our way of life" is more threatened by the policy of imperialism and specific policies of national security than by these small nations. Such criticism ignores the extent to which "our way of life" shows no classical liberal-democratic but neoliberal idiom. That is - the ability of an entrepreneurial entity/state to develop rational country's means and goals to exercise free market rationality and subjectivity by removing obstacles both home and abroad (i.e. preventing Islamic fundamentalism or excessive and arbitrary state sovereignty in the form of Saddam Hussein).

Unlike property rights, civil liberties are less relevant to "homo economicus" in the name of "defending our way of life", because their removal does not project on democracy in its neoliberal form.

According to critics from the Left, the second justification, that the United States could or should rid Afghanistan of Taliban or Iraq from Hussein, is hypocritical because the US previously funded and supported both regimes. Also it is disingenuous since the foreign policy of the United States never rested on the principles of development of democracy or they were not serious in such projects. However, a neoliberal definition of democracy does not denote a set of independent political institutions and civic practices that bring together equality, freedom, autonomy and the principle of popular sovereignty. But merely indicates the

"You can pretend that you are a saint and mock me, of what consists your policy, once you have begun to control the world? From blows of knives and massacres".

Charles de Coster, Tyl Ulenspiegel

By Hegelian terms, in current, post-modern times, there are two historically opposing processes.

One consists of saving capitalism which is on its last legs through primarily American neoliberalism. It is supposed to encompass the whole world but actually helped only the world powers (today only about 200 companies control almost half of world production, 2/3 of Trade and 4/5 investments). – Thesis.

state and entities organized under market rationality. Democracy could be understood as a code for the availability of this rationality. The removal of the Taliban or the Baath Party opens the way to such rationality and democracy is merely a name of the regime. *Izbornik (slobodni, filozofski)*, kolumna 22. srpnja 2014., Wendy Brown: *Neoliberalizam i kraj liberalne demokracije*, [slobodnifilozofski.com/.../wendy-brown-neoliberalizam-i-kraj.ht.](http://slobodnifilozofski.com/.../wendy-brown-neoliberalizam-i-kraj.ht;);

⁴⁸ Crisis of neoliberalism framework remains in the darkness so neoliberals praise Pinochet dictatorship and Bush's attack on Iraq, regardless of the consequences that have accompanied these moves. The, corruption (inevitable in the neo-liberal system) leads to crimes and abuses by the neoliberal governments and states. Problems of private monopolies and privileges that lead to reduction of employee's rights and increasing gap between rich and poor, unemployment and, "the accumulation of disempowerment", all can be hidden or is portrayed as an anomaly that can be overcome within the system. *Filozofija info, članak: Baterijsko viđenje stvarnosti*,

Vladimir Milutinović
novi.filozofijainfo.com/2013/09/22/baterijska-vidjenja-stvarnosti/

Second increasingly affirming process is dialectical antithesis of the aforementioned tendency. It is a struggle against neoliberalism by a large number of parties through various alternative processes. They should initiate the push of mankind for a new social justice society – Antithesis⁴⁸.

United States and "European vassals" (Z. Brzezinski) had its "moment of glory" and world domination, that lasted for two decades (since the fall of the Soviet Union and until the third term of Putin as head of Russia and the parallel rise of China). In that period the US was the only superpower, and sought to have their neoliberal concept implemented worldwide, willingly or unwillingly.

Regardless of its supremacy, it is understandable that America yet primarily sought and seeks that through the non-ethical diplomatic activity that impose neoliberalism worldwide, especially to the developing countries.

First trying the carrot, and if no go, then the beating. That is if a rebellious country is weak and isolated enough. Because imposing by force, including military intervention, can't be applied whenever and wherever.

United States have no awareness of its un-historical role that by rescuing modern capitalism they attempt to stop the history. They just want to maintain the status of the world's first superpower and to continue its comfortable existence through neo-liberal market economy, due to its enormous comparative advantages and neo-colonial system of relations. That refers to its 4% of the planet population consuming 30% of what is produced in the world.

Therefore, if those that United States imposes neoliberal concepts on, do not want to accept it but cannot reject it to

the end, it is "normal" for US to resort to quasi-diplomatic and anti-diplomatic, violent means to achieve its primary objective. Rest of the world perceives such behavior as arrogant and immoral.

It is said, that neoliberalism, despite the occasional illusion of success, is just one of the stages of served out Spirit and it has no historical perspective. To develop and sustain a new paradigm arising from the inevitability of historical development (for instance, defense of newly established civil society from the remaining feudal strongmen) revolutionary and absolutely necessary violence is required because it is the only way to preserve the achievements of the new, valid paradigm. Centuries of criminal domination of the West could be interpreted as a historical necessity. The West has, by exploitation of others, strengthened the rationality that has through the S&T revolution and market relations increased the chances of human survival.

But, that story ends. Period of stupid, inhuman romanticism of repeated assaults by the Polish cavalry on Hitler's tanks is finished. Other civilizations also understood that science is a necessity and priority, so they intensively reach for it too. However, in economic and social terms, non-Western societies, as well as less developed, have preferred state socialism / capitalism as a socio-economic foundation of its development. The West in fact obstructed it (where it could) in and different ways. Mostly by financing fundamentalist and national-religious tendencies, prompting the decays of these societies and their destruction.

Bringing those societies into a state of the dissolution and misery, the West, through local quisling teams, imposed neoliberalism that has by the end destroyed all that was not destroyed by

religious and ethnic wars. With such criminal activities and the help of a variety of diplomatic initiatives, the West thought and thinks to defend the capitalist system in decline.

In other words, the violence without historical justification and which aims to protect the outdated system of interpersonal relationships, is criminal. So are all those who see their future in neoliberalism, and that very much applies to the puppets of the newly formed banana-states. As much as they look important to themselves or they achieve, by force (mainly) or willingly some temporary impressive results, sooner or later they will end up at the dump of history.

Remark. Even when some neoliberal diplomatic moves are fair or neutral, they are part of the criminal activity of the current post-modern era. Their final aim is to blur things and confuse us.

3. The future of diplomacy in postmodernism

In certain times weapons replace diplomacy. It does so when late turns mostly useless (for example, to renegotiate restoring of feudalism within modern civil relations, or compromise with Nazism on concentration camps, etc.).

Although human history knows only a few hundred years without wars in total, war can't be a permanent state. Sooner or later, both in war and in peace, inevitably comes the time of objectives valorization through negotiations on disputed issues. Diplomacy is therefore one of the most important instruments of Hegel's "Cunning mind".

Generally, it is truly ingenious what people - the diplomats, by negotiating

about the subject of conflict with their abilities, by intellectually overriding opponents - achieve. Beside visible successes there is something that they are not aware and what objectively promotes historical values - intention of the "Cunning mind." But, on the other hand, "The Cunning mind" cannot prevent elites in power, their media and diplomats, to naively, irresponsibly and demagogically declare their period and their rule as a permanent historical reality. For example declared eternities of Rome, Third Reich, of communism, capitalism, and other dogmatic concepts of the end of history, etc.

Such do not see that they are a non-essential part of historical objectivity, a pile of dead leaves that a current bears toward nothingness.

Only the great personalities realize that, unlike the apologists of the existing system, they must not hang on to non-historical reality. With their uniqueness, often opposing any common moral and human activity, with their courage and passion, they stream ahead, beyond the paradigm in decline, to achieve historicity.

However, diplomacy of the new age will gradually have one of the most important roles in the twilight of the postmodern period and the beginning of achieving real, genuine utopia of equality of people.

We said that capitalism is historically doomed. Post capitalism (postmodernism) does not hold utopian thought. By rejection of Christian or Marxist utopias, postmodern scholars are mainly prostitutes, paid to "scientifically" glorify neoliberalism, economists to mystify it, soldiers to keep dissatisfied under control and allow the looting of resources of the weak. Finally diplomats are trained to justify and defend this state of affairs.

As a response to such a renunciation of life primarily measured by money and profit such as the multiplication of wars in the developing world, rapid lack of employment in the "affluent nations", strengthening of the right-wing, racist movements, and the like, there are many alternative movements (in all countries and civilizations). These are so far strongly resisting ever more criminal and dying epoch. Although entire repressive and ideological apparatus is still sided with and an old, capitalistic (today neo-liberal) paradigm.

The developing alternative, therefore, cannot fight with weapons, because one does not have them. There is neither an Old Testament God behind them as with the Jewish people. However, Jesus Christ showed that "the Word" may, in the transitional moments of history (i.e. during the transition from slavery to feudalism), beat the ruling power.

Alternatives to the current repressive, neoliberal order will need a huge number of idealists, activists and sophisticated subtle diplomats, believers in the future. They will overpower the force of weapons by force of "Word" and crumble to the end everything historically rotten - neoliberalism that hinders the further progress of humanity.

ZASNIVANJE FILOZOFIJE DIPLOMACIJE

S posebnim osvrtom na (anti)diplomaciju postmodernog, unipolarnog svijeta

«Jedino unutar određene koncepcije istina nalazi uporište svoje egzistencije»
Hegel, Fenomenologija duha

«Svako saznanje zahtijeva koncept, bez obzira
na nesavršenost ili nejasnoću istog»
Kant, Kritika čistog uma

Ključne riječi

*diplomacija, filozofija
diplomacije, međunarodni
odnosi*

Autor

Dr Emil Vlajki je *Professor Emeritus* na Univerzitetu u Banjoj Luci i ugledni naučnik u polju političkih nauka, međunarodnih odnosa, komunikologije i filozofije.

Korespodencija

vemil@teol.net

Oblast

Međunarodni odnosi

DOI

10.5937/pol1612037V

UDK

327:321.01

Datum prijema članka

13.09.2016.

Datum konačnog prihvatanja članka za objavljivanje

27.11.2016.

Sažetak

Diplomacija je, uglavnom, tretirana kao vještina, struka i/ili zanat, sistematizacija je onoga što se događa u praksi, a znači i način uklapanja diplomatske aktivnosti u teoriju i praksu međunarodnih odnosa. Produbljeno razumijevanje diplomacije djelomično je dano kroz etiku te aktivnosti. Ali je ta etika predstavljena u svom metafizičkom obliku i kao takva ima jednostrano, nedinamičko, ne-dijalektičko, manihejsko značenje. Na primjer, mir je nešto što je dobro, moralno, nasilje je zlo i slično. Nastojati da se održi mir je pozitivno, itd. Stvari su potpuno drugačije kada se posmatraju kroz dijalektiku povijesnosti. Historija ne poznaje uobičajeni moral. Nastajanje i nestajanje naroda i civilizacija ima svoje korijene u smislu historije, nasilje se često pokazuje kao nužnost. Da li je nužnost nemoralna? Diplomacija, zasnovana (metaforički) na "riječi" ima svoje korijene u samoj Bibliji, i samim tim je, teorijski, konstitutivan dio filozofije historije. U ovom su tekstu, a vezano za diplomaciju, razmatrani pojmovi totaliteta, njegovog duha, istine, nužnosti, slobode, dijalektike, postmodernizma, neoliberalizma i nagovještaj budućeg, historijski humanijeg društva.