

DIPLOMACY IN THE GAMES OF POWER. DIPLOMACY OF POWER – POWER OF DIPLOMACY II. POWER OF DIPLOMACY

Silviu NEGUȚ*

Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies, Faculty of International Business and Economics,
41 Dacia Blvd., District 1, 010404 Bucharest, Romania; e-mail: silviu.negut@gmail.com

Andreea GAGEA

Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies
e-mail: andreeagagea@yahoo.com

Abstract: In opposition with the *diplomacy of power*, approached in a previous study¹, naturally, it is desirable the *power of diplomacy*, which has proven over time its efficiency and fully responds to the democratic aspirations of a modern world. But, the power of diplomacy will be truly effective and extended only to the measure in which the diplomacy of power will be attenuated (desirable to the extinction), respectively the force one. In this spirit it is essential, among other things, the reforming of the United Nations, the largest international organization. This study addresses, simultaneously, some types of diplomacy which have been practiced and had success on short term (for example, *triangular diplomacy*) or long term (*economic diplomacy, ad hoc diplomacy, preventive diplomacy*). One dwells upon the economic diplomacy, since alongside with the accentuation of the globalization process, elements of power in the domain of international relations are transferred from the political-military side to the economic side. Many analysts appreciate that, in fact, the economic diplomacy is foreshadowed as the most important form of future diplomacy's manifestation. Noting the existence of a large number of small states around the Globe, is approached too their specific diplomacy. Finally, the study seeks to answer also the question regarding the future of diplomacy.

Key words: power diplomacy, triangular diplomacy, economic diplomacy, ad hoc diplomacy, preventive diplomacy, small states diplomacy

* * * * *

In a study published in the previous number of this journal we broached general issues concerning diplomacy, laying stress on the diplomacy of power, actually, the diplomacy of force, reflecting the inequality between the entities present on the world stage at a certain time. In this study, we first treat the

* Corresponding author

¹ Silviu Neguț, Andreea Gagea, *Diplomația în jocurile puterii. Diplomația puterii – puterea diplomației. I. Diplomația puterii*, Romanian Review on Political Geography, 1/2010 (XII) pp. 151-161.

power of diplomacy - the opposite of the diplomacy of power, and other types of diplomacy, such as the preventive diplomacy, the diplomacy of small states - a reality that can not be anymore evaded, since such states, particularly, still proliferate around the Globe - and the economic diplomacy, in fact the main type of diplomacy in the future.

POWER OF DIPLOMACY

At the opposite pole of the *diplomacy of power*², generally, a diplomacy of force, it manifest the *power of diplomacy* and history gives us many examples in this sense, of which we present just a few.

Talleyrand - a consummate diplomat. After an initial ecclesiastical career (achieving the rank of cardinal), he debuts in diplomacy during the French Revolution and officiates in the field for four decades, largely as foreign minister or ambassador. Through training, intelligence and extraordinary abilities, he was able to maintain itself in the forefront of the power, unfolding in time of four completely different power structures. Beyond the personal benefits, he brought great service to France. His glory moment was the participation, as the representative of France, at the famous Congress of Vienna (September 1814 - June 1815), where the great powers who have defeated Napoleon (Britain, Russia, Prussia and Austria), under the guise of establishing a lasting peace, have divided Europe. Skilled politician and diplomat, Talleyrand succeeded through his intrigues, to divide the Allies and, in particular, to limit territorial expansion tendencies of Prussia and Russia, based on the assertion "legitimacy principle" according to which states must return to their legitimate Sovereigns. As a result, Louis XVIII's France kept the area of the Louis XVI's reign, the king obviated by the French Revolution.

European Union vs. United States in the case of for Gaddafi/Kadhafi. Especially after becoming a global hegemon after the implosion of the Soviet Union, the United States have been remarked worldwide by their policy of strength, not giving enough time to negotiations. A first case was the one in Yugoslavia, when NATO states, led by the United States, have interpreted the UN resolution no. 1199 of September 23, 1998 as a legitimate military measures which might be taken against the Belgrade authorities to enforce the provisions of that document. The result is known. There have been many discussions about the legitimacy of NATO's intervention troops before exhausting the diplomatic channels. Following this fact, in the intervention in Iraq (March 2003), the U.S. was supported only by Britain, the "preventive war" launched by President George Bush Jr. was also appreciated as too precipitate, without exhausting the negotiations path. Thus, in both cases we deal with the manifestation of force in international relations.

At the opposite pole is the case of Libya and its leader, Mu`ammer al Gaddafi/Khadafi. He was long-lived on the "black list" because of his anti-Western attitude (mainly, anti-American) - denouncing the "Western imperialism" - exacerbation of Pan-Arabism, suspicions of supporting international terrorism, etc. Ardent proponent of the Pan-Arabism, but leader of a country although large, sparsely populated (only 1.5 million inhabitants in 1969, when he took power, about 6 million today), Gaddafi made several attempts to unite with other Arab

² Subject treated in a previous study (Silviu Neguț) – *Diplomația în jocurile puterii. Diplomația puterii – puterea diplomatică. I. Diplomația puterii*, Romanian Reviv on Political Geography, 1/2010 (XII) pp. 151-161.

countries (successively with Egypt, Tunisia, Syria, Sudan, Chad), none fulfilled, owing to the denial of those countries. Therefore, in the last 15-20 years, he turned towards supporting Pan-Africanism.

Accused of supporting terrorism, Americans resorted to force with the object of punish him, even removing him (one of the attempts failed recently), but Europeans embraced the path of diplomacy, of negotiation. Thus, after a long time sheltering and protecting those who have completed the Lockerbie bombing (the city from Scotland over which exploded a Boeing of the Company PANAM, recording 270 deaths), they were finally brought to the Hague International Court of Justice (January 31, 2001, one of the two Libyan bombers was sentenced to life imprisonment). Furthermore, following the lengthy negotiations led by Romano Prodi, as European Commission President (1999-2004), Gaddafi made an official visit to Brussels at the European Union headquarters (March 2004), during which he confirmed the withdrawal of his support for terrorism and, moreover, has declared himself a supporter of the fight against this phenomenon.

AD HOC DIPLOMACY

This is a type of diplomatic activity about which is spoken less, but is quite common and, especially, with many positive results. That is the case of the special missions used in different occasions, such as protocol and ceremonial functions (the participation at national festivities, the establishment of a head of state, the marriage of a sovereign, the national funerals, etc.), negotiations (political, economic, etc.), treaties or international agreements, participation at conferences or international congresses, sending a message to the head of State or Government of a country etc³.

There is recorded an entire casuistry which demonstrates the relevance of such ad hoc diplomacy moments, occasions wherewith “diplomats” (the heads of State or Government, presidents of Parliament, foreign ministers and other delegates) come into contact with the rulers of the host-countries or their counterparts from other countries that otherwise would have been harder to meet and contact. Among these occasions are mentioned: taking office as president of a major country (United States, France, Russia, etc.), funerals of great political figures (Roosevelt, Stalin, Winston Churchill, Charles de Gaulle, Jawaharlal Nehru, Iosip Broz Tito, Mao Tzedun, Leonid Brezhnev etc.), summits, forums and international conferences of high rank (some attended by representatives from Romania, such as the Economic Forum in Davos, conferences on environment and/ or development - Stockholm in 1972, Rio de Janeiro in 1992, Johannesburg in 1999, Copenhagen in 2008 etc.

One could note transmitting messages by state governors (heads of State or Government) to those of another state; obviously, in problems of high interest, which should not be public, mediating between the entities that had no direct diplomatic relations or are in conflict or trying to incline the balance in a certain direction. Romania too fulfilled such missions, either to create a bridge between the United States and China or to contribute to Israeli-Arab peace agreements etc.

Starting from a generally accepted fact, that in the chronicle historical events, in the immediate entourage of power factors there have been two important characters - the *general* (force expression) and the *ambassador*/

³ See *** *Mic Dicționar Diplomatic Român*, Editura Politică, București, 1969, p. 127-128.

diplomat (flexibility, negotiation expression etc.) - a famous diplomat and historian of diplomacy argues, rightly, that: “*Both the man of arms and the diplomat long practice their science profession, so that during its` practice to raise it at the **level of art** (our emphasis). Skills that can sometimes reach places them in the category of rare figures or unique which substantiate the role of the individual in history (...) The game in which the diplomat is engaged is a sustainable interweaving of interests in the fundamental act of negotiation, which is the supreme test of its` value (...) Its products are shaded and their appreciation depends on the angle from which they are viewed and on their light thrown on future events. Only the perspective highlights a rewarding diplomatic work*”⁴.

PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY

In addition to the actual diplomacy (involving states` diplomatic representatives), high-level diplomacy meetings (specific to political leaders) and secret diplomacy (involving political leaders, group and organization` leaders), it manifests the preventive diplomacy too. This type of diplomacy is applying in an unstable environment, when the use of force or constraints in order to resolve interests or disputes is possible or probable. In fact, this kind of diplomacy does not take into account any type of conflict, human interest or need; it enters in the game only if these can not be resolved peacefully.

The preventive diplomacy involves two essential elements: crisis prevention through preliminary initiatives (actions that focus on the essential differences between two or more parties with the purpose of curbing the problems` increase) and *anticipation of conflict* (by creating a climate of confidence between the parties).

It is appreciated that for its function, there are a few rules that must be fulfilled:

- states have to resist to the traditional practice of an early suspension of the diplomatic relations and to maintain communication with leaders and groups in crisis;
- governments and international organizations have to clearly express their interests in the respective risk situation;
- the crisis has to placed on the agenda of the UN Security Council or other international organizations in order to quickly initiate preventive actions.

Although, similar to the case of secret diplomacy, in the preventive diplomacy the main actors are political leaders, the effective dispute resolution is made by diplomats based on various support elements, among which is included the art of negotiation. It is not casual to say that the essence of diplomacy is the art of negotiation in international relations.

SMALL STATES DIPLOMACY

There are currently 193 countries⁵ around the Globe and about 40 territories “dependent and non-autonomous” (according to the UN Charter) totaling a population of nearly seven billion (6.8 billion at July 1, 2009). Although, it is often spoken about large, medium and small states, as a matter of fact it doesn`t exist a fixed criteria for the classification of countries in these size categories, so it is difficult to define more accurately the number of states in one

⁴ Mircea Malița, *Diplomatul în istorie*, in the volume *Diplomați iluștri*, Editura Politică, București, 1969, p. 5-6.

⁵ It is not included in this figure the state of Kosovo, whose status is still uncertain.

category or another. Habitually, it is used the population criterion, eventually associated with the *surface*, choosing round figures, appreciated as significant⁶.

How do we define small states? One possible answer is found in the enumeration made, in 2007, by an Indian diplomat: The Commonwealth` report from 1985, *Vulnerability: Small States in the global society*, considered the figure of one million or less as a criterion for a small state. Twelve years later, a new Commonwealth` report (presented at the governmental organizations` meeting in Edinburgh, October 1997), entitled *A future for small states: overcoming vulnerability*⁷, revised the figure at one million and a half. In turn, the World Bank also uses such a standard, 49 countries entering into this category, out of which 32 are island states; the vast majority of them are developing countries, in actual fact only seven countries are part of the developed countries` category (Luxembourg, Malta, Iceland, Andorra, Liechtenstein, Monaco, San Marino and Vatican). On the other hand, the “Forum of Small States/ FOSS”, initiated at the UN by Singapore (which is chairing annual several group meetings), defines, as small states, countries with a population below 10 million inhabitants. 93 countries are members of this group⁸.

Can we establish, indeed, an accurate limit in order to designate a category or other of countries? A first problem: where we include countries that exceed the scale set? Can we “move” them automatically from one category to another only because they exceeded the limit settled year to year?; they really change their status? For example, if we consider the figure of 10 million inhabitants, Chad, which in 2008 easily exceeded this threshold, it becomes a mid-country? Contrary: Hungary, which in 2008 fell below 10 million, passed from the medium category states to that of small states? Similar situations one can encounter too in the case of any other limits, for instance that of 1.5 million inhabitants: Guinea-Bissau, in 2008, slightly exceeded the threshold - has this country, really, changed it status? And the examples can continue.

Although, the limit of 10 million seems too high to categorize a country as microstate, the fact that an institutional framework already exists, a *Forum*, which defends and promotes their interests, determine us to take it as a basis for analysis and discussion.

In fact, it matters for small states to find ways, preferably institutionalized, to promote their interests in international relations, since each on its own doesn't have the chance to succeed. It isn't less true, and the history confirms, that, generally, small states defend their own security and promote their interests under the umbrella of larger countries, powerful ones. It became almost a rule that colonial metropolises (Great Britain, France, Spain and others) have become not only “advocates”, but also concrete defenders of the states - former colonies.

It isn't less true that small states have specific concerns in international relations, which shape their own diplomacy. The same Indian diplomat, who was previously cited, identifies a number of *genetic factors*:

- “*The need to manage bilateral and multilateral relations with skills, without depending on the size of the country; some observers insist on the fact that small*

⁶ Silviu Neaguț, *Ministatele insulare*, in volume *Pași pe Terra*, Editura Albatros, București, 1983, p. 165-167.

⁷ Alan K. Henrikson, *Diplomacy and Small States in Today's World*.

⁸ Kishan S. Rana, *The Diplomacy of Small States*, Discussion Paper „Diplomacy of Small States”, February 2007, Malta.

states have greater need to use diplomacy as a shield, since they lack power on the world scene.

- Small states require far more representation in the capitals of major powers than vice versa, this being established empirically.

- It is indispensable for small states being represented in the neighboring capitals [states], often also in the capitals of the major donors of development assistance.

- New York, the world capital of multilateral diplomacy, is used by many small countries for bilateral contacts, but, often, they don't fully use the available options, such as those of non-resident ambassadors and "virtual" embassies (...)

- For some [small states] the representation at EU headquarters in Brussels is a higher priority than the representation in Geneva, which, among other things, is the WTO headquarters [World Trade Organization]. Thus, the support [political] is more important than trade"⁹.

Due to the low economic power - with notable exceptions, such as Singapore, Qatar, Bahrain, Luxembourg, Malta, Brunei, Liechtenstein, Monaco, etc. - small states have turned to less expensive formulas, such as *concomitant accreditation* (a same ambassador accredited in several states), *joint embassies* (several states have one and the same embassy), *non-resident ambassador* (which exercises the diplomatic activity remotely from the country they represent), *honorary consuls* (designated from the citizens of a state in which is required a diplomatic representation), establishing *commercial offices* or *travel agencies* with local staff not from the represented country.

According to many analysts¹⁰, small states diplomacy is polyvalent and, practically, not neglected; among its features being noted:

- small states are sustainers of the state of law and adherents of the UN system: equality of all world states, regardless of size (territorial, demographic, economic, military); therefore, they are upholders of multilateral diplomacy, both within the UN and its specialized institutions, and other international and regional organizations in which one state = one vote (so it doesn't matter the attributes of power);

- plead, mainly, for regional economic cooperation as a support for political cooperation;

- practice *quiet diplomacy*, respectively, are sheltering under the umbrella of a powerful state (or at least more powerful); is, among other things, the case of states - former colonies (mainly, former metropolis of France and United Kingdom) or of states which have some affinity (ethnic, religious, neighborhood, etc.) and also the *support-relation* between Serbia-Russia (based on Pan-Slavism, Pan-Orthodoxism), Belarus-Russia (Pan-Slavism, Pan-Orthodoxism, neighborhood), Paraguay-Brazil (Pan-Latinism, Pan-Catholicism, neighborhood) etc.

In a world that has a high opinion of the democracy's principles and the equality among states, we find that, in practice, these are not implemented, only expressed. In the spirit of such principles, the UN General Assembly should have the greatest importance (since all world states are represented by ambassadors/diplomats) and not the Security Council (with five permanent members which

⁹ Kishan S. Rana, *op cit.*

¹⁰ Ali Nasser Mohamed, *The Diplomacy of Micro-States*, in "Studies in Diplomacy" No. 72, Clingendael Institute, The Hague, January 22 ; Kishan S, Rana, *op.cit.*; Dietrich Kappeler, *New Diplomatic tools and the broadening access of developing states*, in Justin Robertson and Maurice A East eds., *Diplomacy and Developing Nations*, Routledge, London, 2006.

have *veto* power). Precisely because of the deadlock in which the most important international organization find itself, arises more acuity the issue of “UN reform”. Or, as one analyst says, “*The United Nations will continue to lose its prestige due to the combination between a weak Secretary General and a Security Council in a deadlock situation*”¹¹.

According to analysts, one can distinguish six types of diplomacy practiced by the small states:

- *quiet diplomacy*, practiced by professional diplomats, usually, in the former colonial metropolises, which support there cause at global level; the best example is that of the Commonwealth’s microstates, which have “special relations” with London - this practice being known as <“have the ear” of the larger country>;

- *protest diplomacy*, inherited from the colonial period, when obtaining the “sovereignty” was the main objective of those territories, the basic condition being the confrontational one; during the Cold War, it was based on the polarization of multiple states, even some groups, as the case of the *Non-Aligned Movement* or the *Third World*; a more recent example is the reaction of Jamaica Caribbean` state representative as chairman of the International Committee for CARICOM Negotiation, following the summit in Grenada (March 1998) - the European Union` condition regarding the concluding of a new agreement after Lomé IV¹², by abiding the civil and political rights, was categorized as having “the smell of past colonial relations”;

- *group diplomacy*, practiced mostly in international organizations and, especially, at the UN, where are recognized the regional groups formed mainly on geographical basis (on continents or regions); not infrequently such geographical groups contributed to the tilting of the votes` balance;

- *niche diplomacy*, associated especially to so-called *middle powers*, is also practiced by small states that are trying to make a “breach” in a field of international relations, to obtain a right or an advantage etc.; currently, it is conveyed the importance of this type of diplomacy in the acute problems of energy (*energy diplomacy*);

- *enterprise diplomacy*, term introduced into circulation by Alan K. Henrikson¹³, which, according to him, “*it involves more bravery and risk and, perhaps, more imagination and innovation than the <niche diplomacy> does*”; in this category are included the contacts and even the diplomatic relations of many countries in the Caribbean with Fidel Castro’s Cuba, despite the U.S. embargo position;

- *regulatory diplomacy*, a unique form of diplomacy, which could be defined as the intervention of one or more states, by consensus, in order to reinstall democracy or a legally constituted government; an example in this sense is the natural power reinstallation of Jean-Bertrand Aristide`s government in Haiti, as it resulted following the elections - the United States were supported in this action by CARICOM, the action being characterized by an American diplomat as “an inter-American defense regime of diplomacy”; the advocates of such diplomacy type considers that it is necessary, for instance, in the fight against narcoterrorism.

¹¹ Gideon Rachman, (2008), *Financial Times*

¹² In the Togolese capital, Lomé, have been signed four agreements (1975, 1979, 1984, and 1989) between the European Community and 70 countries (the poorest).

¹³ See Alan K. Herikson, *op cit.*, p. 9.

DIPLOMACY OF THE FUTURE

Some analysts speak of the diplomacy's decline, Hans Morgenthau¹⁴, one of the best specialists in international relations, identifies also the factors causing this decline - placed by him at the beginning of the First World War - namely: *the development of the modern communications system, diplomacy's depreciation* (phenomenon seen as a kind of hostility towards the states' modern system, respectively, the power of politics), *diplomacy through parliamentary procedures* (a distancing from the established pattern of diplomacy), *superpowers - the newcomers in diplomacy* (diplomats being, in fact, emissaries of totalitarian governments), *the nature of contemporary world politics* (the inflexible competition between the two superpowers of the Cold War period)¹⁵.

Naturally, emerges the question whether diplomacy has a future. We appeal once again at a highly regarded analyst, who notes: *"If order and anarchy, peace and war would not pose a concern for world nations, they would deny diplomacy, would prepare for war and would hope that the best outcome. If sovereign states, which have supreme power within their territories without listening to any higher power, desire to maintain peace and order in their relations, they must try to persuade, to negotiate and to exert pressure on each other. In other words, they have to practice, to cultivate and to rely on diplomatic procedures"*¹⁶.

Starting from a series of findings on some realities from the beginning of this millennium, a Romanian diplomat and analyst in the field asserts¹⁷: *"Thus, is born, under the eyes of contemporaries, a kind of two-headed World Order: on the one hand, the purposes and principles of the United Nations remain untouched in the Charter; on the other hand, although, several great powers, formally, do not deny the Charter, assign themselves rights"*¹⁸ *which convert the in international law into a dead letter. What international consensus could be built on such foundations?*

Here are some diplomacy dilemmas at the beginning of XXI century. How will they cope with them? In order not to be compromised, becoming the instrument of some policies which broad the breach already existent in the main foundations of World Order, it should be put in her service (the diplomacy) at least a few men of genius or endowed with special talents. But such people are not anymore attracted, in recent years, by the diplomatic game. And that is a pity because, now, perhaps more than other times, the diplomacy is in need of them. The world sails on a rough sea and full of pitfalls".

Today, on the Globe, it occurs simultaneously or successively nearly all kind of diplomacy types known in the course of time. Nevertheless, becomes increasingly present types of diplomacy such as *ad hoc, preventive* and, especially, *economic*.

Consequently, it is more than obvious that diplomacy will not disappear. *"The Third Millennium - says an expert in the field - must be defined by a*

¹⁴ Hans. J. Morgenthau, *Politica între națiuni. Lupta pentru putere și lupta pentru pace*, Editura POLIROM, Iași, 2007, p. 557-562.

¹⁵ The analyst Morgenthau has been unfolding his activity in the period of maximum confrontation between East-West, the two "blocks" having as pillars the Soviet Union and the United States.

¹⁶ Hans J. Morgenthau, *op.cit.*, p. 563.

¹⁷ Constantin Vlad, *Diplomația secolului XX*, Fundația Europeană Titulescu, București, 2006, p. 770.

¹⁸ The author refers, among other things, at the fact that four of the five permanent members of UN Security Council adopted military doctrine, which involve a form of "preventive war".

<diplomacy of progress> in a close interdependence relation with the <progress of diplomacy>¹⁹. Humanity of today and tomorrow can not be dispensed with the main actor in the field: “*The diplomat - notes a leading authority in the field, Mr. Mircea Malița – possesses the art and science of negotiations, which are the supreme expression of communication and dialogue. With them, the diplomat solves the problems of peaceful interaction, settling conflicts and disengaging common interests (...) His true and foremost vocation won the fight with the protocol and conventions. Now, he has in hand all the resources available in the era of computers, including artificial intelligence, to prevent and extinguish conflicts. He also has the most favorable conjuncture offered by the globalization and regionalization processes, eminently peaceful, craving for new solutions and wise ideas. He sees that the negotiation, his specialty, has become a widespread activity in these processes, a mass sport, required and practiced by all professions waiting to learn from him. He feels that the world’s major changes have repercussions on his old profession too. The distance covert helps him to face the new changes and to be confident in the roles he could play with use*”²⁰.

Engaging a mirror analysis between the vision and the mode of action of analysts (who have a greater margin of action and aren’t submitted to any risk) and, respectively, of the state people (politicians) regarding the functions of international systems, the famous American diplomat Henry Kissinger noted: “*The man of state (...) will be judged by history according to how wise he mastered the inevitable change and, above all, agreeably to how well he keeps peace. Here is the reason of why examining the way in which people have dealt World Order problem - what has worked or not and why - is not the end of understanding contemporary diplomacy; it may be, however, the beginning*” (our emphasis)²¹.

In order to support the assertion that diplomacy has a future, it appears also the recent decision of the European Union, the largest regional bloc in the world, to create its own *diplomatic structure*. Catherine Ashton, from Great Britain, was appointed as first chief of the European diplomacy (the official entitling being that of the European Union High Representative for Foreign Policy).

ECONOMIC DIPLOMACY

For several millennia, in the international relations predominated the force politics, thus the pre-eminence of the military power. But, with the increasing of the globalization process, the elements of power in international relations are transferred from the political-military side to the economic (primarily, commercial) and cultural side. Today, obviously, power is not anymore based exclusively on military potential and on the control of a certain territory, more or less extensive, but on the ability and capacity to integrate into the global economy. Hence, it results the importance of such diplomacy, the economic one.

Among the possible definitions of economic diplomacy, we note the one given by a Romanian diplomat with much experience in the field: “*On the terms of a clearly defined proximate genus, that of a state` diplomacy as an activity engaged to achieve foreign policy goals, we can consider economic diplomacy as the kind of diplomacy that puts into direct equation the state’s foreign policy with*

¹⁹ Dumitru Mazilu, *Diplomația europeană*, Editura Lumina Lex, București, 2008, p. 12.

²⁰ Mircea Malița (2007), *Jocuri pe scena lumii. Conflicte, negocieri, diplomație*, Editura C.H.Beck, București, p. 231.

²¹ Henry Kissinger (2003), *Diplomația*, Editura ALL, București, p. 24.

*the welfare of its citizens, using all institutional instruments, human and technical for promoting outside the interests of the respective state*²².

As well highlights a good specialist in the domain, economic diplomacy is not new: *“Of all times, the defense of traders, who unfold their activity on foreign lands, the support of their activities and the safety of commercial roads have mattered in states` foreign policy as part of their fundamental mission to protect its conational and to conduct relations with foreign authorities. What is new is the broadening of the horizons thanks to the explosion of new subjects, which orientate diplomacy towards new methods, new working agendas and new places*²³. If the former economic diplomacy was a commercial diplomacy, that of today is an economic one in the broadest sense. Owing to the growing complexity of the economic relations, it is no longer only negotiated the free exchange of goods, as formerly, but also the services, capital movements, tax rules and investment protection. As the same French analyst says: *“Because of the economies` mondalization (or rather globalization), the global economic balance has become a matter of common interest. There isn't anymore a localized crisis, a currency turbulence in Asia is affecting Central Europe, Latin America and many other areas. Formerly, states interfered only when their interests were directly affected, the rest being just encroachment. From now on they feel affected by the economic health of their partners (...), the gap of the development level (...), the international liquidity level (...), economic policies developed in exterior (...) etc. All these problems are not just interna*²⁴.

Many agree that the *rules of the economic game* are equally *diplomatic stakes*, thus the economic diplomacy is very important and representatives of the states or regional blocks/ groups are obliged to conduct an activity which will provide them a desired or a desirable place in the global configuration. In a world as competitive as that in which we live in, as it is known, states no longer own the monopoly of the international authority, but remain important, the accent moving towards international organizations (such as International Monetary Fund, World Bank, World Trade Organization, etc.), regional organizations (European Union, the most notable, NAFTA, MERCOSUR, ASEAN, etc.), global governance factors (like the G8, including the most developed and, obviously, powerful countries on the Global scene) etc..

More than any other type of diplomacy, the economic diplomacy is beyond the sphere of traditional diplomacies, belonging to the ministry's sector of any country (usually is called the Ministry of Foreign Affairs). It is practically exercised by representatives of all ministries in a state, with interests in the field (as, for example, ministries of trade and/ or industries, tourism, transport, etc.). In addition, in a world where transnational corporations (STN) play an increasingly important role on the world stage (supplying, practically, the state, traditional actor in the field), is very important the power of companies (transnational) with autochthonous capital that operates in other countries. In such a context clearly grow the prerogatives of economic diplomats accredited in other countries²⁵.

Without a rule specified by a treaty/ agreement or arrangement, all world states recognize the regulator role of major international institutions, like IMF, World Bank, WTO etc. Moreover, countries that did not recognized this status, had and still have problems in the field, such as Cuba, North Korea (communist) and others.

²² Radu Șerban, *Diplomație economică europeană*, Editura Tribuna Economică, București, 2009, p. 17.

²³ Guy Carson de la Carrière, *La diplomatie économique*,

²⁴ *Idem*.

²⁵ See there competences in Radu Șerban, *op.cit.*, p. 17-18.

Although the role of the economic factor has become so powerful nowadays, it seems premature to say that we have entered in a truly *geo-economic world*, since yet the finality is primarily political. But, anyway, the economic diplomacy foreshadows as the most important manifestation form of future diplomacy.

CONCLUSIONS

Diplomacy's history - which is part of international relations' history that, in turn, inserts into human history - is strewn by an impressive casuistry, which proves the role of domain's representatives (diplomats) in international negotiations as a whole. These negotiations were conducted by representatives (diplomats) of one or some great powers with those of their homologous or with emissaries of weaker countries. Depending on the ratio of forces and interests, but also in accordance with the quality of negotiators (diplomats), it resulted enslaving or favoring agreements or treaties.

The whole history shows that, not infrequently, were combined the diplomacy of power with the power of diplomacy. One of the most convincing examples is Camp David Agreement of 1978, when the United States, through that time President, Jimmy Carter, have negotiated the historic understanding between Israel (Prime Minister Menahem Begin) and Egypt (President Anwar el Sadat). After weeks of negotiations they reached a settlement and the agreement was signed, which led directly to the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt in 1979, through which both countries earned something: Egypt regained the Sinai Peninsula, and Israel made a breach among hostile Arab countries. It is clear that, beyond the *diplomacy of power* (the United States that wanted to impose and to arrogate the merit of great power which had solved the conflict), this agreement was also the outcome of the *power of representatives' diplomacy* from the two countries, who knew very well their interests and knew how to promote them too.

In the same context, one could mention that Romania too, although it never had been a great power, has played, in some cases, an important role: "*The Bucharest regime skillfully exploited the international context, assuming its mediator' role in the Vietnam conflict, in the Middle East conflict and in the normalization of American-Chinese relations*"²⁶.

The twentieth century and early twenty first century were marked by an unprecedented diversification of diplomacy' types and of means and methods used by it. The idea that emerges is that, in addition to the genres established long time, stand out more and more types such as preventive diplomacy, economic diplomacy, etc.

REFERENCES

- CARRON DE LA CARRIÈRE, G., (1988), *La diplomatie économique*, Economica, Paris;
 CONSTANTIN, V., (2006), *Diplomația secolului XX*, Fundația Europeană Titulescu, București;
 CONSTANTINIU, F., (2007), *Cuvânt Înainte* in volume Mircea Malița, *Tablouri din Războiul Rece. Memorii ale unui diplomat român*, Editura C.H.BECK, București;
 HENRIKSON, A.K., *Diplomacy and Small States in Today's World*;
 KAPPELER, D., (2006), *New Diplomatic tools and the broadening access of developing states*, in Justin Robertson and Maurice A East eds., *Diplomacy and Developing Nations*, Routledge, London;

²⁶ Acad. Florin Constantiniu (2007), *Cuvânt Înainte* in volume Mircea Malița, *Tablouri din Războiul Rece. Memorii ale unui diplomat român*, Editura C.H.BECK, București, p. XI.

- KISSINGER, H., (2003), *Diplomația*, Editura ALL, București;
- MALIȚA, M., (1969), *Diplomatul în istorie*, în volume *Diplomați iluștri*, Editura Politică, București;
- MALIȚA, M., (2007), *Jocuri pe scena lumii. Conflicte, negocieri, diplomație*, Editura C.H.Beck, București;
- MAZILU, D., (2008), *Diplomația europeană*, Editura Lumina Lex, București;
- MOHAMED, A.N., *The Diplomacy of Micro-States*, in "Studies in Diplomacy" No. 72, Clingendael Institute, The Hague, January 22;
- MORGENTHAU, H.J., (2007), *Politica între națiuni. Lupta pentru putere și lupta pentru pace*, Editura POLIROM, Iași;
- NEGUȚ, S., (1983), *Ministatele insulare*, în volumul *Pași pe Terra*, Editura Albatros, București;
- NEGUȚ, S., GAGEA A. (2010), *Diplomația în jocurile puterii. Diplomația puterii – puterea diplomației. I. Diplomația puterii*, Revista Română de Geografie Politică;
- RACHMAN, G., (2008), *Financial Times*
- RANA, K.S., (2007), *The Diplomacy of Small States*, Discussion Paper „Diplomacy of Small States”, Malta;
- ȘERBAN, R., (2009), *Diplomație economică europeană*, Editura Tribuna Economică, București;
- *** (1967), *Mic Dicționar Diplomatic Român*, Editura Politică, București.

Submitted:
December 15, 2010

Revised:
March 25, 2011

Accepted:
May 3, 2011

Published online:
May 5, 2011