CHAPTER V

DIPLOMACY AND PROPAGANDA

DIPLOMACY

INSTITUTIONS, RULES AND PERSONNEL

In the present international system which comprises of around 175 states, whose economic, political and military interdependence means that almost any major domestic or foreign policy decision, will have repercussions on the interests of many others. In this setting the problems of achieving mutually acceptable solutions to all issues is difficult and usually cannot be resolved through the relatively slow and cumbersome process of bilateral negotiations. Thus the correlation between economic, scientific and technological development; and the growth of diplomacy to its present dimensions. It is no accident that the most rapid growth of permanent multilateral diplomatic institutions occurred simultaneously with the fastest period of industrial and technological development. The bilateral pattern of diplomatic communications of the 18th century gave way first to ad hoc multilateral conferences, and later on to permanent multilateral, diplomatic and technical organisations.¹

Today the concept of multilateral conference diplomacy is institutionalised in the United Nations and its specialised agencies. These organisations are widely known, but multilateral diplomacy also occurs constantly in thousands of ad hoc conferences and less formal meetings between diplomats and governmental officials.

Not only has a large portion of diplomatic communications become channelised through multilateral institutions and organisations, but even in multilateral relations the institutional framework of communication has become increasingly complex, as the range of issues common to any set of states has expanded. Earlier a diplomat was expected to be a shrewd hail fellow well met type of individual who looked after the interest of his state by means of tact and common sense.² Today however,
the diplomat at the ambassadoral level, in order to achieve success in influencing the government to which he is accredited, must command a knowledge of a wide variety of affairs and subjects, including economics, propaganda techniques, labour relations and all facets of political analysis. He frequently administers an embassy with a staff of several hundred specialists and aides. Office routine, expertise and discipline within a bureaucratic organisation have replaced the glamour and leisure of the earlier days. Another significant development in diplomatic procedure has been the rapid increase in direct communications between the Chief Executives of the various states. As the modes of transportation and communication have made interchange of ideas between high ranking officials and policymakers easier and faster which can by-pass the traditional diplomatic intermediary.

Whether conducted by trained diplomats or by Chief Executives of the states, communications between governments representing widely diverse social, economic and political systems is naturally liable to all sorts of distortion owing to cultural differences, ideological cleavages, and plain misunderstanding. Since permanent diplomatic institutions were established in Italy during the 15th century, governments have commonly recognised that it is to their mutual advantage to observe certain rules of procedure that help make communications easier to conduct and less liable to distortion. Three sets of rules concerning protocol, immunities, and non-interference have therefore been developed in International Law and Custom to facilitate communication between states.

Protocol

Diplomatic protocol is of considerable importance in assisting diplomats to pursue their tasks in an effective manner. Although the ritual of protocol may seem merely ceremonial leftover of a by-gone era, they have a definite function even today. In 1815, four diplomatic ranks were established and universally. These are in descending order Ambassador and Papal Nuncio, Envoy Extraordinary and Ministers, Ministers Resident, and charge d'affairs. These titles are still in use today and determine the ranking of diplomats at ceremonial functions. The question of precedence was decided at the Congress at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818. The diplomat who has served the longest period in a certain capital is normally referred to as the "doyen" or "dean" of the diplomatic corps, and on ceremonial
Another aspect of protocol that influences the efficiency of the diplomatic process is language, for precision of communication is one of the major requirements of effective diplomacy. The use of rhetorics is declining, and there is an increasing tendency in diplomatic communications to be frank and avoid any impression of being dilatory. Formerly by adhering to strict rules of etiquette, diplomats could phrase statements that gave precise meaning without creating the impression of impoliteness or belligerence. Today much of the formality has been replaced by frankness and in some cases, vulgarity and name calling, polemics and intemperateness. For example, the incident of the Syrian diplomat calling the Israeli Prime Minister a terrorist in the first session of the Arab-Israeli talks being held under the supervision of the two superpowers in early 1992, held at Madrid.

Immunities

If the governments are to seek to influence each other's policies and actions through effective communication, they must assume that their diplomatic agents abroad will not be abused or placed under conditions that would prevent them from engaging freely in bargaining and persuasion. Even among primitive societies, messengers were usually regarded as sacrosanct and enjoyed special privileges and immunities when travelling or meeting an opponent. In the ancient civilisations of China, Greece and India diplomatic immunity was regularly accorded. In the Mahabharat it is written "The Morarch who slays an envoy sinks into hell along with his ministers".

It is still the general rule of International Law that a diplomat and his embassy are treated as if they were on their own native soil. They are immune from persecution under the laws, customs, rules and regulations of the government, to which they are accredited. Those who enjoy diplomatic status may not be molested by national police and law enforcement officials, nor may the premises of the embassy be visited by the local law enforcement officials without the invitation of the embassy staff. However, the diplomatic official commits a serious crime abroad, the host government may either demand that the official be recalled or request that his immunity be lifted so that he can be indicted.
and tried in the host countries courts of law. If the country whose envoy has committed the crime does not recall, or lift his diplomatic status than the host country can declare the diplomat as persona non grata, thus forcing his recall. In most cases governments do recall their diplomats when asked to do so, and designating a diplomat as persona non grata usually results from a diplomat's political actions, not from breaking a local law. Ambassadors and other diplomatic officials are usually declared as person non grata when they have made statements that the host country considers as interference in it's internal affairs, or when they are found indulging in covert information gathering techniques - espionage. Retaliation has also become an accepted practice, that is if a diplomat is expelled by country ; the country whose diplomat has been expelled usually also expels a diplomat of the first country.

Non-interference

If diplomatic officials normally enjoy immunity from the laws of the country to which they are accredited, other customs have developed that limit the type of actions they undertake in attempting to influence the policies of the host government. Chief among them is the stricture that they cannot in any way interfere in the internal political process of the host country. Normally they are expected to confine official discussions to government personnel. Certainly they may defend their own country's policies to foreign public by addressing groups, but they cannot make appeals to these people asking them to put pressure on their own government, nor can they provide funds to political parties, or provide leadership or other services to insurgents, political factions, or economic organisations.

These rules of non interference are well established in law and practice, but as the domestic affairs of the countries have become increasing important foreign policy implications, the rules are in many cases circumvented. Diplomats do in practice foment civil disorder, subsidise subversion and disseminate covert propaganda.

Classification of Diplomats

Thus far we have used the word diplomat in a loose and general sense to include all members of the foreign services of all nations. Not all diplomacy is carried out by diplomats. In a sense every citizen of a state who travels to another state is a diplomat, although not a very
skillful one. In a professional sense, diplomats include two main groups: diplomatic officers and consular officers. Though all diplomatic functions are carried out by both the groups, but generally speaking, diplomatic officials specialise in representation and negotiation, whereas consular officials are particularly concerned with the protection of interests of nationals of their countries.

The top positions in the diplomatic service are held by the chief of the mission, most of whom have rank of Ambassador. The various ranks of diplomats who form the diplomatic hierarchy are based upon the rules agreed upon at the Congress of Vienna in 1815. Ambassadors constitute a very small fraction in the number of diplomats, most of whom are career officials or non career specialists. Unlike the upper hierarchy, there is no agreed basis for classifying all the lesser diplomats, but at least three ranks are widely recognised. There are counsellors of embassy who rank highest among diplomatic staff members; secretaries of the embassy, usually ranked as first, second and third secretaries; and attachés who may be junior career officers or non career persons serving in a diplomatic capacity on a temporary basis including commercial, agricultural, military, naval, air, petroleum, cultural, energy, sports and press etc.

Appointment and Reception of Diplomats
Each state appoints its diplomatic representatives in its own way, but appointments are generally followed by certain internationally recognised procedures. As a rule, the nomination of a diplomat will be publicly announced only after the country to which he is to be sent has given its approval. No country is obliged to accept a foreign representative who for any reason is a persona non grata to it, in fact there have been many cases in which the name is refused. Ordinarily, before proceeding to a new post, a diplomat would spend some time in his capital. There he will confer with the Chief Executive of the state, the Foreign Minister and other officials of the foreign services, and the diplomatic representatives in his own capital who are from the state to which he is being sent. He will study the past relations between the two countries, he will be briefed by experts, and before leaving to assume the new post the diplomat will be furnished with important papers, including diplomatic passports for himself and
and his family and staff, and a letter of credence.

The letter of credence is a diplomat's formal commission. It is signed by the head of the state and it is addressed to the head of state to which the diplomat is accredited. As soon as he arrives at his new post he is supposed to immediately get in touch with the foreign minister to request an audience with the head of state in order that he may present his letter of credence. The ceremony of presentation may be accompanied by the most elaborate rituals and formality. Essentially it consists of a brief speech by the envoy, and another in the same vein by the head of state as he accepts the letter of credence.

Termination of Diplomatic Mission

The termination of the diplomatic mission may come about in a number of ways. The diplomat might resign. A mission may be terminated by the recall or the dismissal of the envoy. He may be recalled by his own government on it's volition, or his recall may be asked for by the state to which he is accredited. In the latter case, the request for the recall may be made because the diplomat personally has become persona non grata, or because the relations between the states concerned have become so strained that recall is demanded, possibly as a preliminary to actual hostilities.

FUNCTIONS OF DIPLOMATS

A diplomat is concerned to be the eyes and ears of his own government. His chief functions are to execute the policies of his own country, to protect it's interests and the interests of it's nationals and to keep his government informed of developments in the rest of the world. Sir Henry Wotten, a seventeenth century poet envoy said that "An Ambassador is an honest man sent to lie abroad for his country." Similar sentiments were expressed by Stalin who said that "A diplomat's words must have no relation to actions.... otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy us no more possible than dry water or wooden iron."

Negotiating and Bargaining

Virtually a synonym for diplomacy, negotiation is par excellence the pursuit of agreement by compromise and direct personal contact. Their
duties include drafting of a wide variety of bilateral and multilateral arrangements embodied in treaties, conventions, protocols and other documents of political, economic and social nature, with subjects ranging from the creation of an international security organisation, through territorial changes, establishment of rules to govern international agreement on various issues, and the adjustment of international commercial relationships to such particular matters as immigration, double taxation, tourist travel, and exchange control. Almost the entire gamut of human activities are covered.

Because of the developments in communications and the increasing resort to multilateral diplomacy, diplomats do not play as great a role in international negotiations as they once did. Most agreements between states are still bilateral and concluded through negotiations between the foreign offices by the use of ordinary diplomatic channels. But the major international agreements, especially those of multilateral character are usually negotiated directly by the foreign ministers or their special representatives, often at international conferences.

Obtaining Information and Reporting
Because information and data are the raw materials of foreign policy, the gathering of information - by the official acts, at cocktail parties, or by covert means - is the most important task of the diplomat, aside from his bargaining activities. Precise information must be made available to those who formulate policy if there is to a minimum discrepancy between the objective environment and the image of the environment held by policy makers. The data gathered covers nearly every conceivable subject. Although the diplomat may also provide a large quantity of raw data in his reports, his main role in providing information is to use skill and familiarity with the foreign society, to interpret the data and make reliable assessments and forecasts of responses of the receiving government towards his own government's policies. The diplomat might be asked to predict answers to some such questions: What are the implications of the host government's foreign policy if a new party is elected to power or a military junta gains control through a coup d'etat? What position might the foreign government take in a future international conference on tariffs, or on the regulation of narcotics, or spread of nuclear arms, or on the issues before the United Nations?
The success of a diplomat in assessing and answering such questions will depend upon the scope and variety of sources of information he is able to cultivate among the party leaders, government officials, trade union, press and military. The ambassador or diplomat who relies too heavily on one official source is likely to obtain only a distorted version of reality.

Diplomatic officials obtain vital information by a variety of means. Most of it comes from reading and examining reports, debates, newspapers and magazine published in the country where they are stationed. Information is also obtained through informal means. Entertainment is prime means. Although legislators and tax payers frequently disparage diplomats for wasting time and money on parties and dinners, but there are definite advantages to these informal occasions. In a light setting it is often easier to persuade and obtain vital information. Rumours can be assessed and verified, personal reactions elicited and all types of interesting information obtained more easily at social functions than during official calls and in official communications.

Symbolic Representation

In his role as a symbolic representative, the diplomat of other eras seldom did more than attend court ceremonies; today however, the ambassador, in addition to attending ceremonial and social occasions, must address foreign groups and be present at all events with which his country is somehow connected, no matter how remotely. In the eyes of many citizens of the host country, the diplomat is a country's representative and that country is judged to a great extent according to the personal impression he makes.

Protection of Interests of Nationals

This function which involves protecting the lives and promoting the interests of nationals residing or travelling abroad is a routine task, although during catastrophes or civil disorders, the role of diplomats in this capacity may become very important. Nationals have to be protected or evacuated if necessary, they must be represented by legal council if jailed and their property and other interests abroad be protected.

Providing Advice

Another very important function of diplomats is to provide to those who formulate goals and plans of actions, and occasionally to make import-
ant policy decisions themselves. All diplomats serve in a sense as policy
makers, because they provide a large portion of the information upon
which policy is based. A principal contribution of a diplomat in the
policy making process thus comes from his skill of interpretation and
judgement about condition in the country to which he is accredited.
But even if a diplomat is particularly useful in this capacity, it does
not mean that his judgement will always be considered or that his advice
or warning will be heeded. A diplomat's influence in the formulation
of a nation's goals will depend upon a number of considerations. If
the diplomat enjoys political prestige among the top policy experts
at the home foreign office and if he has a reputation of reliability,
initiative, and resourcefulness and refrains from attempting to sabotage
official policy in its execution, he may be called upon frequently to
make policy recommendations, his function will include advice as well
as providing information. The diplomat will probably not have any role
in formulating the broad objectives of government policy abroad, but
given those broad objectives, he may be asked to suggest the best ways
to achieve them.

DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION
In most cases, the purpose of negotiations between two or more governments
is to change or sustain each other's objectives, to reach agreement
over some issue. However such negotiations may have purposes or side
effects as well. Before analysing the techniques diplomats employ in
bargaining and securing agreements, these other objectives should be
noted.19

First, a large amount of diplomatic communication between governments
is undertaken primarily for exchanging views, probing intentions, and
attempting to convince other governments that certain actions, such
as attending a conference, lowering of tariffs or proffering diplomatic
support on a particular international issue, would be in their interest.
Here there is no bargaining and diplomatic or government officials do
not ordinarily employ threats or offers rewards. The majority of routine
diplomatic contacts between governments is of this nature, and many
visits by heads of states are undertaken not for bargaining, but simply
for exchanging views and consulting.
Second, bilateral diplomatic meeting or multilateral conferences may be arranged for the purpose of stalling or creating the illusion that a government is seriously interested in bargaining, even though it really desires no agreement. During the conduct of warfare, one state may agree to armistice negotiations to assuage public opinion, while it simultaneously steps up its military campaigns. By agreeing to negotiate, it may be able to draw attention away from its other activities.

Third, a government may enter into diplomatic negotiations primarily for the purpose of making propaganda, it uses the conference not so much to reach agreement over a limited range of issues as to make broad appeals to the outside public, partly to undermine the bargaining position of its opponents. As many diplomatic negotiations are open to press and public, conference is certain to receive extensive publicity around the world and thus offers an excellent forum for influencing public attitudes. Any time two or more governments cannot agree, or do not wish to agree, upon the issues under consideration and yet desire to gain some advantage from the efforts, they are likely to use the proceeding primarily to embarrass their opponents and extol their own actions and attitudes. The open forum of the General Assembly of the U.N. offers one important arena for attempting to influence non-diplomatic opinion. Observers of the U.N. affairs note that most speeches made in the body are designated primarily for domestic and international public consumption, not for the information or use of the other delegates.

The trained observer can easily discern when a party to diplomatic negotiations is exploiting a conference or meeting primarily for the purposes of influencing the attitudes of the general public, rather than for changing the bargaining positions of its opponents. Persistent use of slogans, epithets, vague phrases and repetition of totally unacceptable positions indicate that bargaining is not the real purpose of the discussion. Other techniques include repeated attempts to discredit the opposition, deliberate and frequent misrepresentation of the other party's position, wide spread discussion of subjects not on the agenda, or inconsistent statements.

The Paris negotiations on ending the war in Vietnam exemplify the use of conferences essentially for the purpose of biding time and making
broad propaganda appeals to outside audiences. The North Vietnamese were aware of the internal compulsions of United States. It would have been foolish on their part to have really negotiated at that point of time when total victory was very much within their grasp. However at the same time they could not very well refuse to participate in a peace conference - a refusal would have labeled them as the war mongers. As such they decided to participate but were not willing to negotiate.

Diplomacy, however is used primarily to reach agreements, compromises, and settlements where the state's objectives conflict. It involves, whether in private meetings or publicised conferences the attempt to change the policies, actions, objectives, and attitudes of other governments and their diplomats by persuasion, offering rewards, exchanging concessions, or making threats.

DIPLOMATIC NEGOTIATIONS

Negotiations for Problem Solving

The easiest negotiation that diplomats tackle are negotiations for problem solving. Problem solving is a process where two or more parties attempt to develop rules to handle some problem or problems arising in the physical and diplomatic environment. The parties generally see that common study of a problem, pooling of resources, and general cooperation, may result in mutual advantages, and that no major value will have to be sacrificed to obtain an agreement. Differences may arise over the exact specifications of rights, duties and costs, but these are primarily matters of detail that lie above and underlying consensus on objectives.

The thousands of scientific, cultural, technical, economic, and communication treaties and institutions are the result of parties getting together to resolve some problems common to them where they recognise that unilateral action would be fruitless.

Negotiators in problem solving situations usually begin by presenting data and technical studies of a problem. These form the basis of proposals put forth as draft treaties or constitutions for a new international organisation. Often the technical research, analysis, and interpretation of data are conducted by specialists from more than one government working together. Problem solving normally expresses the gains to be achieved through mutual concessions, and the diplomacy emphasises that it is
basically in the national interest to make short term sacrifices for greater long term gains. The point to emphasize is that of all diplomatic contacts between governments, and between governments and international organizations, problem solving predominates. But the public is less aware of it as it is carried out less dramatically, and therefore does not get adequate media coverage. 22

Negotiating for Inducing Agreement

Bargaining over contentious issues may begin through a series of signals by the parties concerned to the effect that they are willing to enter into formal discussions. Once the parties have agreed to enter into negotiations, a number of preliminary points have to be resolved before actual negotiation takes place. Some of the preliminary issues involved in the negotiating process are, first of all location and place where talks are to be held. If the diplomatic negotiations are to take place between adversaries, talks are generally held in a city selected in a neutral country, this has become a customization rule in the past three decades. Geneva has become a very popular location for multilateral conferences. Vienna and Helsinki are other popular locations for multilateral talks. If on the other hand the talks are between states who normally maintain friendly relations then they will usually take place in the capital of one of the negotiating parties.

The parties to be represented often create problems. Take the case of Palestine where Israel has recently agreed in late 1991, to accept to share the table with a Jordanian delegation including Palestinian representatives. The usual criteria is: Who is involved in the issue in question? Those who have some stake in the outcome are normally invited. But problems arise when some parties do not possess diplomatic status. Take the case of the early stages of the Paris negotiations over Vietnam, which started in 1968, involving lengthy discussions about whether or not Viet Cong could be separately represented from the delegation of North Vietnam. This complicated question then brought up related issues: what should be the shape of the table round which discussions would take place? Negotiations about this problem went on for several weeks, until eventually United States accepted the Viet Cong as a distinct party to the negotiations.

Finally, agreements have to be made on the problems of translation,
publication of documents, the role of the advisors, and whether or not the meetings would be open to the press. All these matters may occupy a great deal of time.

Many of these preliminary quibbling may seem to the uninitiated public to be trivial, but these preliminaries are seen by the delegates or governments as reflecting upon questions of fundamental importance, including their bargaining strength and prestige. The implications of each minor procedural decision may be great. For example, the United States delegation initially opposed the Viet Cong as a separate party, but after the preliminaries they accepted it and thereby indirectly accepted that Viet Cong did indeed represent a political movement in Vietnam, quite separate from government and the Communist Party of North Vietnam. Same is the case of Israel in accepting to talk to the PLO in an indirect manner.

Another critical issue is whether the negotiations are to be open or closed to the press? If the talks are to be open to the press they will contain much more propaganda, the discussion will be prolonged, and much of the rhetoric would be designed to impress the public opinion at home, not for the delegations sitting on the other side of the table. Another factor is whether the discussions are between two parties, or more? And whether the situation is perceived to be critical by all the parties. Closely related is the time that is perceived to be available. If the parties see the situation is running out of hand, requiring some solution then there will be great pressure to focus on immediate issues and reduce the amount of careful probing of intentions and evaluation of each of the opponent's statements. There may be a feeling that any solution is better than letting events take their course.

The negotiations may be expected to take on particular characteristics if at least one the parties plays the role of an official or unofficial mediator. The bargaining process is a complicating phenomenon, but favourable solutions are more likely if one party can propose sets of alternatives different from those put forth by the main protagonists, or can make certain that the communications between the adversaries does not break down.23

The choice of techniques and tactics to be employed in diplomatic negotiations depends generally upon the degree of incompatibility between
two or more nations objectives and interests, the extent to which the nations are committed to those interests and the degree to which the parties want to reach agreement. Diplomatic negotiations between friends and allies seldom display the same characteristics as those between hostile governments. Where there is already some agreement about the principals of an issue negotiations may involve only working out the details. When governments are responsive to each other's interest, they have a good basis for arranging for compromises and exchanging concessions.

A common desire to reach an agreement may also induce the bargaining agents to make concessions. The alternative is to adhere inflexibility to a position, prevent agreement and accept the adverse publicity for adopting such a position.24

Where the objectives are fundamentally incompatible and both sides maintain strong commitment to their respective positions the problem of influencing behaviour, actions and objectives through diplomatic bargaining becomes much more complex. In such a situation a two stage process is needed. First, one party must get the other to want an agreement of some sort, somehow make the other realise that an agreement would be preferable to the status quo of incompatible positions, or the consequences of nonagreement would be less favourable to him than the consequences of an agreement. Second, once the stage of agreeing for an agreement has been reached the two parties must still bargain over the specific terms of the final agreement.25

The first step of this two stage process, is probably more difficult to achieve when commitments of incompatible objectives are strong, as long as one or both parties believe they can achieve their objectives through actions other than negotiations, diplomatic bargaining cannot lead to a settlement.

Generally, negotiations are not used for bargaining but to mark time, discuss other issues, make propaganda and give the impression that serious talks are proceeding. They also help in realising the relative strengths and weaknesses of opponents.

If both sides have made the prior decision that agreement is more desirable than nonagreement it remains for them to bargain over the specific details of the settlement. Diplomats can employ a great variety of bargaining techniques. Basically they present their condition define
their own objectives, and use persuasion by making arguments or presenting data illustrate the correctness of their views or the degrees of their needs. Occasionally they can use threats and offers of rewards for obtaining the acceptance of their proposals, and if this fails, reassess their original positions in terms of possible concessions that they hope will elicit agreement or a change in the objectives of the other side. All the time they must simultaneously reveal their commitment to their bargaining positions, otherwise the other party may assume that they do not feel strongly about their condition and would be willing to compromise them without significant compensation.

Promise of rewards is in a sense a bribe that offers some future advantage in return for agreement on a specific point under contention. These may range from promises of soft peace terms, monetary aid or some diplomatic support at some future conference. Threats can be in the nature of breaking off diplomatic relations, economic embargoes, withdrawal of foreign aid, blockade, or a threat to start hostilities etc.

The effectiveness of threatening actions depend above all on their credibility. The effectiveness and credibility of a threat would also depend upon some symmetry between the magnitude of threat and the issue under contention. To be credible threat must also appear to be one sided. In some instances, those who make threats may also have to take certain actions that demonstrate that they have the capacity of fulfilling them. This might involve mobilising troops, cutting off foreign aid or trade, ordering a reduction of embassy personnel, staging a walkout from a conference, or any other action that would indicate that the party using the threat has the will and the capability to carry it out.

In some cases it might be advantageous to make deliberately vague threats or ominous warnings. Although these might not have the same credibility, they have the advantage to the threatening party many alternative forms of punishing actions, or inaction.

The problem of making threats in diplomatic negotiations is that even if they are reasonably credible, the other side might test them. If the threat is actually challenged, it has failed it's purpose.

Diplomatic negotiations normally start with all sides presenting their maximum demands, usually the position they would like ideally
to achieve in negotiations. Since diplomats realise that initial positions are maximum positions, they must probe to find out how far their opponents are willing to pull back from such position. During the negotiation process they bargain about various proposals until some point of compromise has been reached. But where that point is located depends on the effectiveness of persuasion, presentation of data and arguments, threats and rewards, and also to the extent to which a diplomat can convince others that he and his government are committed to certain points, principles and values. If the opponent knows or suspects that a government is not deeply committed to one of it's proposals or bargaining positions, they will be inclined to demand excessive concessions, hoping to attain a point of compromise much more advantageous to themselves. Compromise after all does not require that the parties place the point of agreement exactly halfway between the initial positions. An important part of the diplomatic negotiation strategy is concerned with the efforts of the bargaining agents to show each other, as convincingly as possible, why a position cannot be compromised beyond a certain point. One way is to argue that as much as the government or diplomatic delegation would like to make further concessions, it cannot do so for the fear of alienating the public at home.

Another way is to transform a dispute over a relatively concrete issue such as a piece of land into a matter of principle. This strategy is called "issue escalation", which is designed to illustrate commitment, for it is generally understood that concessions over principles are harder to make than concessions over trivial matters. When one side has firmly displayed a commitment to a position, it is in a better position to resist demands for a concession.

The problem of escalating commitment is that governments and diplomats decrease their bargaining flexibility and in effect cut off the possibility of backing down in case the opponent seriously presses his demands. If both sides remain committed, particularly publically committed, to fundamentally incompatible positions of principle, then little room remains for effective bargaining.

Persuasions through arguments and presentation of information, offering rewards, making threats, and establishing commitment are thus the major techniques employed in the process of diplomatic bargaining between
nations. Some of the problems common to techniques have been discussed above, but each bargaining situation is unique, and no one can predict with certainty which method of inducement will work.

Besides the basic strategies involving threats, rewards and commitments, there are some other strategies which can be used, these are discussed briefly. One is to exploit the impatience of the opponents, if they want the agreement quickly, and induce them to make concessions they might avoid were they content to engage in a lengthy bargaining process. The foremost ploy used to exploit impatience is haggling over minor details, introducing new and unexpected topics for the agenda, and evading crucial points. Conversely overall settlements may be reached more quickly by starting with quick agreements on small and minor issues where considerable consensus prevails, and subsequently exploiting this momentum to obtain concessions on important issues. A further technique is to offer large concessions at first, on the assumptions that if you show your goodwill, the other side will feel compelled to respond. This is however, a calculated gamble, for if the other side does not come through with expected concessions, you are left either to maintain your original concessions and continue making even more until some point of compromise is found, or retract concessions, a action that, although frequently performed in disarmament negotiations, leaves you open to charge of not negotiating in good faith. Finally, a government and its diplomats can threaten to increase its demands later on if the opponents do not take what is offered now.

Negotiating with Force

Coercive diplomacy tries to initiate behaviour by fear. Coercion deals with action that is taking place, or has taken place. To coerce, a state puts in motion a policy to make the other move, in the interest of action. It is the opponent who must act in order to avoid a collision.

Coercion can be defensive or offensive in nature. Defensive coercion may be attempted, for example to persuade an opponent to stop or undo an encroachment viewed as highly dangerous to peace. Its purpose is clearly to maintain status quo. Offensive coercion may be attempted to blackmail an adversary in an effort to make him give up something that he already possesses simply because it is easier to take it peacefully rather than by the use of force. It is important to make this distinction.
Regardless of its particular purpose, successful coercive diplomacy requires that one state create in an adversary the expectation of unacceptable costs that will erode his motivation to continue whatever he is doing. Coercion like deterrence, tries to use threats not to harm an adversary physically or to negate his capabilities, but to effect his will. It attempts to convince and persuade.

The coercing state must convince the opponent that it has both the will and the ability to inflict considerable damages upon something that the opponent values more than the object of dispute, and thereby to persuade an opponent to take the kind of action desired by the coercing state. To operationalise this bargaining strategy, a state must begin by convincing the opponent of its strength and determination. There is a problem of credibility in intimidation. Since neither side wants conflict to end in disaster — and both sides are acutely aware of this fact — the coercing power must convince the opponent that he must be the one to turn aside if catastrophe is to be avoided.

Persuading an opponent in coercion, may also be enhanced by combining certain incentives with the threats — or a classic carrot and stick approach. The presence of concessions is often a fundamental requirement for the management and resolution of conflicts. In addition to limiting one's demands on the opponent, the inclusion of positive inducements may significantly encourage a settlement by reducing and opponent's disinclination to comply with what is demanded of him. There is of course, an inherent incentive in that both the coerced and coercing parties generally would prefer to avoid the mutually unpleasant consequences of an enforced threat. This particular inducement may not always suffice, however, and the very feasibility of coercive diplomacy may be dependent upon the inclusion of genuine concessions. Accomodating gestures made concurrently with coercive tactics may defuse a confrontation of much of its emotional overtones of hostility, duress and engagement of 'face'.

Bargaining is seen as a contest in which each side attempts to maximise its own gains at the expense of others. The objectives are seen as manipulating or influencing an opponent's behaviour by threat of superior military force, making him back down or capitulate, gaining concessions and thereby furthering one's own ambitions in the international arena. Any attempt to bargain entails elements of both conflict and cooperation.
It is the conflicting issues that precipitate clash but it is the cooperative interests that encourage each side to bargain. Without common interests there is nothing to negotiate for. Without conflict nothing to negotiate about. During most bargaining situations this creates a kind of adverse partnership, in which each side tries to uphold essential national interests while at the same time experiencing a shared risk, a mutual desire to avoid the consequences of an enforced threat and common interest to escape disaster of war.

Bargaining is highly competitive and dangerous process with threats, manipulations and counter threats. Each side has certain objectives for which it is willing not only to tolerate but also create risks of possible war. These risks produce uncertainties that often cannot be entirely controlled by the protagonists. Threats may provoke anger, frustration, pride, suspicion or a desire for revenge which, in turn may lead to highly emotional rather than calculated behaviour. The threats of one side may be regarded with contempt and thus not treated with seriousness they deserve. Or one state might overestimate its own ability to persuade and dangerously underestimate the opponent's disinclination to yield.

A closely related problem is that of possible escalation when bargaining with threat of force. Although the threat may make an adversary more accommodating, as is their purpose, this is far from a foregone conclusion. Threats by their very nature, excite rather than inhibit tensions. Thus they may easily boomerang or precipitate a chain reaction. One side can prevail in increasing threats only if the opponent does not do the same. If on the other hand, each protagonist matches any threats by the opponent with an equivalent or even greater threat of its own, serious complications arise. As described by Clausewitz, "Each side, therefore, compels its opponent to follow suit, a reciprocal action is started which must lead, in theory, to extremes". Each increase by the escalation ladder dangerously heightens the tension and inexorably raises the stakes for both. Finally they may reach a point where each sides commitment of prestige and resources become so great that it calculate that it can afford to back down. The expectation that the adversary will capitulate is replaced by the decision that the adversary must capitulate. When this occurs, control and flexibility in bargaining
are significantly diminished, if not reduced completely.

Successful coercion requires that the state being coerced is made to believe that there is an asymmetry of motivation favouring the coercing state, clarity of objectives, usable military options and sufficient fear of unacceptable costs on the part of the opponent, among many other conditions. To determine whether these appropriate conditions exist and to measure accurately the calculations, motivation or fear of each side in an international dispute, however, is an extremely difficult, if not impossible task.

PROPAGANDA

Until the nineteenth century, the interest of any political unit were usually closely related to the personal and dynastic interests of its rulers. The wielding of influence was limited to direct contacts between those who made policy for the state. Diplomats bargained and court officials made policy decisions, but all were relatively indifferent to the public response abroad. They had to influence their counterparts, not foreign populations. Communications across the boundaries of political units were in any case sporadic. Travel was limited and populations were isolated from outside influences, if a diplomat could not achieve his government's designs through straightforward bargaining, it would not avail him to appeal to foreign populations which had no decisive influence in policy making.

With the development of mass politics -widespread involvement of average citizens in political affairs and the widening scope of private contacts between people of different nationalities, the psychological and public opinion dimensions of foreign policy have become increasingly important. Insofar as people combined into various interest groups play a role in determining policy objectives and the means used to achieve or defend them, they themselves become a target of persuasion. In contemporary world, states through their diplomats and propagandists, try to influence the attitudes and behaviours of foreign populations of specific ethnic, class, religious, economic or language groups within those populations.
Virtually all states conduct external information programs, howsoever, big or small they may be. All major powers have large bureaucracies at home and officials abroad whose task is to create favourable attitudes abroad for their own state's policies. As there are extensive networks of non-government transactions in the world, propaganda is also conducted at unofficial levels, where a group or movement in one state seeks to alter or reinforce attitudes in others.

The flow of communications may become even more complex if groups within the society attempt to directly alter attitudes and policies of a foreign government. For example, the consumer boycott of South African wines by the U.S. Such unofficial lines of persuasion and propaganda are extensively used in today's world, particularly as the importance of non-state actors increase in international politics. Multinational Corporations not only disseminate commercial advertisement but work on governments and public, through propaganda techniques and campaigns, to try to create a better climate for investment and operations. Transnational voluntary organisations frequently employ information officers to tell their story. And terrorist groups and individuals have resorted to skyjacking, kidnapping and seemingly senseless killings as a means of publishing their grievances throughout the world. The sudden dramatic act can have a much greater political impact than the standard propaganda program disseminated through print or broadcasting.

What is Propaganda?

Not all political communication is propaganda, nor all diplomatic exchanges undertaken to modify foreign attitudes and actions. Propaganda is the deliberate attempt by some individuals or group to form, control or alter the attitudes of other groups by the use of the instruments of communications, with the intention that in any given situation the restriction of those so influenced will be what the propagandist desires.

Propaganda has four elements. These are:

1. A Communicator with the intention of changing attitudes, opinions, values, and behaviour of others.
2. The media of Communication.
3. The symbols written, spoken and behavioural, used by the communicator.
4. The Audience, or as it is often called the Target.
Propaganda is essentially a process of persuasion, it cannot be equated with the scientific efforts to arrive at the truth. It is not a logical discourse or a dialectical investigation. It relies more on selection of facts, partial explanations and predetermined answers. The content of propaganda is therefore seldom completely true, but neither is it completely false, as it is sometimes assumed. The propagandist is concerned with maximisation of persuasiveness, not adhering to some standards of scholarship or uncovering facts, but to use facts selectively, emotionally and persuasively to convince the maximum number of people in the target group.\(^{36}\)

**Target Audience**

The first peacetime propaganda programmes were initiated by the Soviets and the Nazis. The programs were based on intuition, experiments, and revolutionary experience. The propaganda techniques were based on perceptive analysis of the psychological traits of human beings in their political roles. The propagandist carefully selected targets and attempted to formulate messages that would appeal specifically to that particular group. Despite the rapid development of communication media in the past century, only a relatively small number of people in any given society are the likely targets of foreign originated information.\(^{37}\) For example some sections of populations of the states of J & K and Punjab, for the propaganda originating in Pakistan.

Among those who are the potential targets, how effective are the communications, and what personal and social characteristics predispose people to react favourably to foreign sponsored messages? This involves the study of the basic personality of the target group. Whether they have been bought up in a liberal environment or in deeply fundamentalist environment the basic attitudes towards objects is the "nuclear" personality and the "Social" personality is effected by it. It is the behaviour pattern of the people as a group.

It has been found in some families, politics is not a matter of general discussion, therefore the child forms his own opinions, based on his own experiences and social relationships outside the family as he grows up. This socialisation peculiar to any given society formulated the person's basic attitudes. In some families political attitudes are instilled into the child to the extent that no amount of propaganda, or even personal experience would change them. The "nuclear" personality and
attitudes central to it are not amenable to change simply because they are being subject to well designed propaganda.

It has been found that it is easier to change the attitudes of small associated groups such as classes, or small associations, which already share similar attitudes than of an entire population, which does not constitute a likely target unless all the members of the society are strongly united on some value such as maintenance of national prestige or independance. It is the propagandist's job to find the key group in the society and determine what kinds of appeal will arouse the desired response in the selected group. The techniques to do so were first systematically developed under Goebbles the information minister in Hitler's government.

The next important question is, how does the individual handle information and experience that directly contradicts his established attitudes? It has been found that people are resourceful in resisting information that does not fit their own picture of reality. Those who do subject themselves to the information that contradicts their views may lose confidence of their opinions but will frequently go out of their way to seek any information that substantiates their original position. Others when exposed to unfriendly information, may reject it or perhaps distort it's meaning and significance, or they might question their credibility of the information or it's source, and pass it off as mere propaganda.

Certainly the individual's initial attitude towards the communicator will have an important bearing on his reception of the information. We can see these mechanics operating frequently when we are confronted with information emanating from a hostile country or a political party.

It has been found that communication can be effective in shaping attitudes, where no strong predisposition exists, against the communicator and his ideas. People could form attitudes towards new objects; they can change attitudes weakly held or when several attitudes are evenly balanced they may be able to strengthen one of them; these are the practicable limits of good propaganda. It has also been found that information of some personal use to the target is likely to be most effective.

Propaganda may also successfully arouse or create desired attitudes and opinions if it is the major or sole source of information for a
particular target. The propagandist has an advantage if he provides
information on a new subject or issue, where public attitudes are not
already crystallised.

Propaganda is apt to be effective when directed towards people who
share at least partially the attitudes of the communicator. It is more
successful in strengthening existing attitudes and crystallising predis-
positions than in converting those that are hostile.

Third, propaganda is more likely to be effective on youth, as they
are more vulnerable to suggestions and persuasions, because they are
least likely to hold rigid beliefs or attitudes.

Finally propaganda seems to be more effective when directed towards
groups and towards crowds. It has been found that people are more sugge-
stible in a crowd, as it has been noted that individual credulity
usually tends to fall to a low level when emotions are aroused in
large gatherings. In their domestic propaganda the Nazis were well aware
of this characteristic and put on fantastic parades and party rallies
to impress the people.

Creating Impact

After the selection of appropriate targets, the second task of the propa-
gandist is to catch the attention of those to whom he will direct his
message. Attention getting is a difficult endeavour, particularly among
people apathetic and hostile to the communicator. Therefore the devices
used by the propagandist tend to be spectacular, colourful or unusual
and may not be related to the substance of the message. When attention
is elicited, propagandist then attempt to evoke and play on emotions.
This obviously cannot be done by presenting a calm catalogue of facts,
except where facts speak for themselves. Rather symbols are used to
bring about an emotional response from anxiety and guilt to hatred,
which is probably the most potent of all unifying emotions.

Propagandist frequently appeal to hatred or try to create them, during
times of great international tension and in the actual conduct of war,
when a maximum number of people and allies have to be mobilised to support
the government. In these circumstances hatred of the national enemy
becomes a virtue, while the emotions of love, anxiety and guilt are
seldom included in the various propaganda themes.

These emotions can be raised through almost any communication medium.
Orators can inspire crowds to violent acts simply by giving information, such as that of atrocities which cause revulsion and subsequent hatred.

The image that a foreign population possess of other countries are usually based on news reports, movies, magazines, TV coverage, and cultural events rather than on direct experience, as such their concepts and attitudes towards foreign states are seldom detailed. Spectacular news making foreign policy actions will be noticed by a relatively broad section of the foreign population, whereas regular government information programs abroad will reach a much smaller audience.

Where a great discrepancy between the words and actions of government exists, either people abroad become disillusioned or the credibility of the propagandist is compromised, thus making the target population vary of incoming information.

Methods and Techniques

The art of propaganda is similar to the art of selling, and like the advertiser and salesman, the propagandist must study his market and tailor his product to suit his demand. He must analyse the preconceptions, the fears, the desires, and the weaknesses of the group to be approached in order to use the most promising techniques to achieve his purpose. The number of techniques are very large and depend upon the situation and innovativeness of the propagandist. Some of the propaganda strategies are:

1. The strategy of softening the foreign population by identifying their government as "puppets", "satellites" or "oppressors", make charges of corruption against them and use any means to discredit the established authority. If various group loyalties to their own government could be shaken or destroyed, it becomes an easier task to substitute loyalties. The groups who are already alienated from the government are the prime targets; another strategy exploits potential and actual divisions within a society, often leading to violent action in form of strikes, riots and terrorist acts. The violence damages the international prestige of the state, undermines local confidence in it and may force it to take unpopular repressive measures; another strategy attempts to split allies from each other. In this instead of provoking class, religious or ethnic hatred within a society, it tries to unite the society by suggesting that state's allies are unreliable, scheming or ready to sell out the interest of friends.
Having established a target and appropriate strategy, propagandist then may use a variety of techniques in delivering the messages. Among the prominent ones are:

**Name Calling** - The propagandist attaches an emotion laden name to a person or country. Such stereotype symbols are used which are already prevalent in the public.

**Glittering Generalities** - This is a similar technique like name calling but here it is used to an idea or policy rather than individual.

**Transfer** - The propagandist attempts to identify one idea, person, country or policy with another to make the target approve or disapprove it.

**Plain Folks** - Any propagandist would try to identify as closely as possible with the values and style of life of the target's by using local slangs, accent and idioms.

**Testimonial** - Here the propagandist uses an esteemed person or institution to endorse or criticize an idea or political entity.

**Appeal to Authority** - Here the target is asked to believe something simply because some authority says it is true.

**Selection** - Almost all propaganda, even when it uses the other techniques discussed above, relies on the selection of facts. The propagandist seldom presents his material in such a way as to assert both pros and cons of an issue. This approach is more like a trial lawyer's who carefully organizes his arguments to prove one side of the case. The propagandist uses only those facts required to prove his predetermined objectives.

**Bandwagon** - This technique plays on the audience's desire to belong or be in accord with the crowd.

**Frustration Scapegoat** - One easy way to create hatred and relieve frustrations is to create a scapegoat. Revolutionary regimes faced with complex internal economic and social disorders and popular frustrations frequently create an internal or external "spook" to account for the miseries.

We find that these techniques are used not only in foreign propaganda but in all organised efforts to persuade, including political campaigns and particularly in commercial advertisement. Several of these techniques may be used simultaneously to create maximum effect.

**Necessary Characteristics**

When utilising propaganda it should be realised that people form opinions, make judgements, and undertake actions on the basis of their mental
images, perceptions and attitudes, regardless of whether such square with objective reality. There are certain attributes that are necessary if propaganda messages are to be successful in influencing the target.

These are:

1. The message must be short and simple. Most elements of the general public are not interested in, nor do they comprehend detailed sophisticated explanations. Indeed as a rule they will be turned off by such messages. To be effective propaganda must be direct, concise and elementary.

2. The communication must play on the target's emotions. Calm, rational appeal seldom has much impact. Emotion laden terms tend to effect images and attitudes much more than carefully reasoned arguments.

3. The communication must be of some direct interest to the recipient. If it does not deal with a problem that is of immediate personal concern then at best it would be ignored and it may even be considered an attempt at deception. Because of this communications related to improving a person's living standards or eliminating local injustices usually are more effectual than those dealing with great issues of war and peace.

4. The message must be credible and believable. If what is said is ludicrous or at least it appears so to the target, once again the best one could hope is that the reaction would be neutral, and many times such propaganda is counterproductive.

5. To be credible, the message must be visible. There must be something tangible that makes this message real in the eyes of the target. After the Soviets launched the Sputnik in 1957 there professions of technological capabilities seemed more real then they were before.

6. The message must sympathetically identify with the local experience of the target.

Having analysed the particular situation, selected the targets, determined which attitudes, perceptions, images may be susceptible, chosen the most appropriate tools and techniques, and put together a message with necessary characteristics, the policymaker is ready to employ the instruments of propaganda. There is another principle that one needs to remember, unless the message is repeated and repeated and repeated, it is unlikely to prove effective. As any good advertiser knows, people are not much affected by a message they have seen only once.