Chapter -III

Diplomacy as an instrument of Anti terrorist Policy:
An Assesment

Twentieth century diplomacy, has been characterized by new techniques, new practices and new types of diplomats. There has been, in the words of Kenneth W. Thompson, a "novel, revolutionary and world wide institutionalizing of diplomacy." This has led to multilateralism and 'parliamentary diplomacy'. This development is clearly an effort "to adjust organically to the fact that now a days international problems usually have world wide, or at least regional implications". In the absence of a world legislature or regional legislature, recourse is taken to diplomatic negotiations on a world wide or a multilateral basis to solve international problems. The diplomatic negotiations are undertaken by means of conferences. There are conferences and meetings of all kinds, independent and temporary bodies, permanent international organizations, some pointed toward the
conclusion of treaties and agreements whereas others more consultative in nature. These conferences and meetings have given rise to new forms in diplomacy, such as, diplomacy by conference, summit diplomacy, parliamentary diplomacy, and the consultative diplomacy pursued in various regional organizations.

A large segment of the business of international relations is thus conducted today through the medium of international conferences and the periodic meetings of international organizations. This is termed conference diplomacy. The term diplomacy by conference, in other words, is used to describe 'the frequent recourse to multilateral method' by which nations are doing business with each other of with each of the other Regional states. "Diplomacy by conference", thus today is a technique of diplomatic negotiations and like all aspects of diplomacy is surrounded by numerous and complicated rules of procedure. Hence a birds eye view of Diplomatic growth in a orinological way to the possible extent is
made here in this chapter before thronging light on its new matte of an anti terrorist policy.

Diplomacy by conference has taken on over increasing importance since the time of World War I. In the post war world international conference have 'proliferated as never before'. This does not mean that conference diplomacy originated after World War I. It goes back at least to the congress of Westphalia (1642-48) which laid the foundations for the modern state system. Other historical landmarks of multilateral diplomacy are the Congress of Utrecht (1713), Congress of Vienna (1815), the meetings of members of Quadruple Alliance, the Panama Conference of American States (1826), Petersburg Conference (1868), Congress of Paris (1856) the Congress of Berlin (1884-85) and the two Hague Conferences (1899 and 1907). The World War I, give a new impetus to the conference idea. During that War the Allies established many joint groups which functioned more or less continuously to determine and implement common policies on different aspects of the war effort.
After the war, the creation of the League of Nations in 1919 introduced "a permanent, regularly organized conference system, with institutional continuity, as a supplement to routine diplomatic methods." A number of conference followed in succession during inter war years. A Disarmament Conference at Washington (1921-22) an Economic Conference at Genoa (1922) another Disarmament conference at Geneva (1927) and still another at London (1930), a conference on nationality problems at The Hague (1930) and so it went During World War II there was a great elaboration of the conference method of handling international problems among the Allies. With the Terrorist activities increasing around the world, the United Nations with its annual General Assembly and more frequent meetings of the Security Council and other agencies to find a solution to the menace of terrorism has considerably expanded the dimensions of multilateral diplomacy. The Economic and Social Council is a principal organ of the United Nations and associated with the United Nations are many specialized agencies, the activities of which involve numerous conferences. The United
Nations, to put it in a nutshell, has carried conference diplomacy a step further in the light of the Terrorist activities.

Apart from the United Nations, the regional and other groupings of states, have also contributed to the growth of conference diplomacy.\(^6\) with a evolving focus on Anti Terrorist policies. The NATO Council, the organization of American States, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization the Commonwealth, the council of the Arab League, the meetings of CENTO (Central Treaty Organization) ANZUS Alliance of Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, and Warsaw Pact states provide illustrations of diplomacy by conference. In 1955 there was a conference of 29 Afro Asian states in Bandung and there have been numerous conferences of African states, the one significant was at Addis Ababa in 1963 leading to the establishment of Organization of African Unity (OAU).

Six thousand to ten thousand sessions of international conferences are now held each year.\(^7\)
Most numerous conferences are held under the aegis of the United Nations. It is estimated that United Nations now sponsor more than five thousand meetings each year. The international negotiations have, therefore, became a heavy burden on the foreign ministers and other top policy makers. James F Byrnes, who served as secretary of State for 562 days, actually spent 350 days or 62 per cent of the time, attending various international conferences. The participation of the United states in international conferences has greatly increased (see Table-I) its function ability.

Diplomacy by conference has its own merits and demerits. The judgements on the utility of conference method vary, depending largely on the standard employed.'

The merits of conference diplomacy are:

(i) it gives small states a voice and an equal vote with Great Powers
(ii) it gives the sponsoring state or states a chance to play a dominant role

(iii) it helps in developing significant partnerships of effort, joint thinking, and combined activities that are important to the members or the community

(iv) it has contributed to the growth of the concept of community in Europe, as evidenced by the movement for European unity and formation of EEC

(v) it has crystallized and encouraged a new type of diplomatic intercourse diplomacy by parliamentary procedure

(vi) it is an 'open diplomacy', and takes on the character of a 'public spectacle and encourages posturing, playing to the audiences, and engaging in propagandizing

(vii) it is claimed that the 'best hope of the prevention of war lie in the 'judicious development of diplomacy by conferences'

(viii) its obstacles to secrecy its tendency toward informality and the conviction that more
 heads meant more wisdom combined to make it this a popular type of diplomacy.¹⁰

(ix) it enables the members 'to settle outstanding issues' and

(x) it helps members 'to seek out informal contacts and engage in informal caucusing and lobbying, and thereby 'to speed the communication and decision process.'

The demerits of conference diplomacy are:

(i) the distinct advantage enjoyed by sponsoring state or states over other participants in matters of organization and procedure may be regarded as 'unfair and objectionable' by non sponsoring states, which may jump to the conclusion ,when they are invited to a conference, that they are to be made the victims of some carefully planned plot ¹¹

(ii) it is likely to be deficient in preparations because there is no international machinery to prepare for it, the participating states are
without the benefit of the preliminary surveys, draft conventions, and so on that are useful in organization conferences.\footnote{12}

(iii) it lacks the needed machinery to follow up and check on the implementation of its decisions by the participating states after its sessions have come to an end.\footnote{13}

(iv) it provides a dangerous temptation to participants to use the technique for propaganda purposes and weaknesses to the point of exacerbating differences.\footnote{14}

(v) it sometimes hampers serious negotiations because the participating members use the conference as an advertising stunt designed to win friends and influence people.

(vi) its decisions, though technically free, may be made under various internal and external pressures.\footnote{15}

(vii) its emphasis on informality may lead to confusion and more heads seemed to result in more conflicts of interest, rather than in more wisdom.\footnote{16}
(viii) it is less adaptable to major points of tension \(^{17}\)
(ix) it epitomizes in the bargaining for votes, logrolling and similar techniques familiar in legislative assemblies \(^{18}\) and
(x) it has to a large extent "ceased to be an instrument for ending conflict and has become one for continuing it

Diplomacy by conferences is unquestionably a technique of diplomacy. Its success depends upon "elasticity of procedure, small numbers, informality, mutual acquaintance, and if possible, personal friendship among the member principals, a proper perspective between secrecy in deliberation and publicity in results, reliable secretaries and interpreters. An eminent British diplomat, Sir Victor Wellesley observed " The success of the new method depends partly on the degree of preparation and agreement which has been reached before hand. Many conferences have failed for lack of this. The effect of public opinion on the negotiation during the
discussions has a powerful influence on the result. To negotiate in the lime light of public opinion is most embarrassing to delegates because they have from the first to take up a position from which they cannot recede and so jeopardies the possibility of an agreement by compromise. Thus, the necessity for preparing leaves much for diplomacy to do behind the scenes, though the technical character of so many international problems of first class importance makes it increasingly necessary that even preparatory work should be undertaken by experts rather than diplomatists. Thus, diplomacy by conference as method is indispensable in modern context of international relations, requiring utmost caution, wisdom and flexibility on the part of diplomats to achieve and bargain something out of a conference table.

Summit meetings are conferences of leading statesmen heads of states or governments able to make important political decisions and conclude agreements, possibly without ordinary governmental
Although it is an ancient practice, the label summit diplomacy is quite new or summitry is old wine in new bottle. Sir Winston Churchill coined the phrase in 1953, when he proposed a conference of western and Soviet heads of governments. The press and public caught the idea. The label summit diplomacy became popular in diplomatic parlance.

Apart from the Personal diplomacy by emperors, kings, princes, and prime ministers which goes back to antiquity. In his study of Summit Diplomacy Professor Plischke, calls attention to the fact that in 1280 B.C. Rameses II of Egypt and Kink Khetasar of the Hittites negotiated a treaty whose text is still extant. that Personal diplomacy was practiced by all those great men who have made history so far. by Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Charlemagne, Henry VIII of England, Francis I of France, Frederic the Great, and Napoleon Bonaparte. The congress of Vienna (1815) was attended by a galaxy of kings, princes and ministers. The role of participating rulers and statesmen in the periodic congresses (1815-1822) the
Congress of Paris (1856) and the Congress of Berlin (1878) was great he says. The Paris Peace Conference of 1919 included a notable list of heads of state and Lloyd George, Prime Minster Clemenceau, Prime Minister Orlando, and others. During the 1920s and early 1930s the leading statesmen approved personally some of the most important political arrangements at conferences. The major decisions affecting the course of World War II and post war international order were made during the several personal meetings between the big three Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin and the less frequent meetings of others leaders. The most publicized post war summit conference was held in Geneva in July 1955 attended by President Eisenhower (US) Sir Anthony Eden (Britain), Faure France, and Bulganin and Khrushcheve (Russia). Although the Geneva summit could hardly solve the tangled problems of German reunification, European security, arms limitation and the related problems, but the words spoken at Geneva were "for the most part polite and smiles were emitted from time to time, those with an optimistic view of affairs referred to the Geneva
spirits as the monumental accomplishment of the meeting. More cynical observers said that the only things the President brought back for Geneva were toys for his grandchildren. Second effort to hold a similar conference in 1960 broke down on the eve of the scheduled opening. The Bandung conference 1955, and the conferences of non aligned states in Belgrade in 1961 and in Cairo in 1964 are notable illustrations. The Tashkent summit conference attended by Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri India and President Aybu Khan Pakistan in January, 1966 through the good offices of Prime Minister Kosygin Soviet Union, has added to the dimensions of this new technique in international diplomacy. African prime ministers and heads of states have frequently participated in conferences held under the auspices of the Organization for African Unity. The May 1972 Moscow summit between President Nixon and Brezhnev was more symbolic than substantive. Brezhnev's visit to Washington in June 1973 for a second summit with President Nixon underlines the reality of the growing détente between the two super powers. The examples of
summit and near summit diplomacy are numerous. It has become increasingly common in recent years.

Some of the post war leaders, particularly Adenauer, de Gaulle, Macmillan, Eisenhower Kennedy, and, of course Khrushchev, practiced personal diplomacy. Similar practices were made until recently by Clinton and Bush in view of the palestine problem.

President Eisenhower during his first term entertained exactly fifty heads of state and heads of government his last four years brought in visitors at about the same rate. Khrushchev emphasized top level contacts of all kinds. He traveled in all directions on goodwill trips and advocated summit conferences with his western opponents. Adenauer did not like summit meetings unless a meeting of minds was in sight. General de Gaulle was also extremely cautious in this respect. He was only following philipe de Commynes’ (1471-1551) advice “Two Great Princes who wish to establish good personal relations should never
Reasons for the popularity of summit diplomacy are as follows

(i) The rise of dictatorial rulers who are more free than their democratic colleagues to make personal decisions. The prominence of the United States as an active world power has produced similar effects because of the great constitutional powers vested in the president.

(ii) The development of quick transportation, in particular air transportation. This in itself seems to be a standing invitation to hop on a plane and visit foreign capitals or to go to the appointed rendezvous with other principal leaders.

(iii) The meetings of the United Nations, which provide frequent opportunities for personal diplomacy.

(iv) The widespread fear of a nuclear catastrophe, which is constantly nourished by ever
recurring crises and which generates pressure for personal meetings between chief executives.

The record of summit diplomacy, indicates that definite advantages and definite liabilities are inherent in the use of heads of state as negotiators of international issues.

The advantages of summit diplomacy are:

(i) it can be useful where there is a genuine will to mutual agreement it encourages world statesmen to 'sell their political ideas' in other countries;

(ii) it enables world leaders to commit their countries to a given agreement;

(iii) it brings together mature understanding of he problems of international politics;

(iv) it may concentrate on the 'clarification of positions' and the definition of 'areas of agreements and disagreements;
(v) it enables top level men to remain on 'speaking terms'; and
(vi) it is 'spectacular diplomacy', it has sensation and glamour around it.

The disadvantages of summit diplomacy:

(i) it can be a 'hazardous undertaking and involves large risks';
(ii) it makes available to the chief executives 'a limited time' and the conferences are of 'short duration';
(iii) it reduces the importance of 'regular diplomacy;
(iv) its proceedings suffer from the fact that top level men are "unschooled in the legal niceties of drafting notes, unfamiliar with the complex economic and military problems attending political issues, and unversed in the nuances of international communication".
(v) it barely suffices to acquaint the participants with each other, much less with their conflicting interests.  

(vi) It is extremely a difficult task as it requires from chief executives a 'simultaneously playing politics at home and abroad'. The chief executive who tackles diplomacy while keeping in constant touch with his capital vai cable, telephone, or teletype is incapable of devoting the careful, patient, and judicious care that negotiations demand.  

(vii) It increases the 'risk of personalization of policy';  

(viii) It is conducted under a 'tremendous pressure' on the participants for publicity, for positive results and for some kind of diplomatic victory;  

(ix) It may lead to intensification of tension and precipitate an international crisis in case the heads of state fail to reach a happy compromise;
(x) It may preclude a 'fresh effort at diplomacy' or lead to 'stalemate'; and

(xi) It may be "turned by an aggressive power with a closely geared propaganda apparatus into a device for gaining worldwide publicity for its own views and posture while putting others on the defensive or to serious embarrassment."

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, before assuming office, wrote in 'Foreign Affairs':

"Such experience as we have had with summit diplomacy does not encourage the view that it contributes to the advancement of American interests. I conclude that summit diplomacy is to be approached with the wariness with which a prudent physician prescribes a habit forming drug a technique to be employed rarely and under the most exceptional circumstances, with rigorous safeguards against its becoming a debilitating or dangerous habit."
Summit conferencing, in Secretary Rusk's thinking, is objectionable in that it "diverts time and energy from exactly the point at which we can spare it least". President Kennedy, too was skeptical of the procedure, at least for negotiating purposes, before going to the White House. He stated his position in these words: "There are occasions when traditional exchanges require diplomacy between diplomats in the countries involved are in the national interest and that, I think, was what Mr. Rusk was directing his attention to. I am hopeful from those more traditional exchanges that we can perhaps find a greater common ground."

Despite its drawbacks and pitfalls, summit diplomacy have become almost unavoidable in contemporary international policies. Especially in the light of the increasing Terrorist activities and the immediate alternation it deserved.

If summitry and personal diplomacy of leading statesmen are here to stay, their disadvantages can
be avoided and their advantages can be maximized by thoughtful preparation though regular diplomatic channels and carefully selected emissaries.

The end of World War II brought fundamental changes in European politics. The emergence of super powers made Europe 'weak and small. Its historical state system was destroyed. Half of the continent passed under Soviet control. The expansion of the Soviet empire to Central Europe, the loss of most overseas possessions, and the emergence of new power centers on the globe gave sudden strength to the slogan Europe, unite or perish. The complex international problems of post war Europe could not have been solved on the basis of traditional diplomatic practices. Imaginative western statesmanship invented new approaches and methods which are not to be found in the annals of traditional diplomacy.

The European states, as such, established coordinating bodies and regional organizations. The
regional organizations are mainly of two types economic and military. The inter Scandinavian economic bodies, Franco Italian and French British economic groups, the Benelux union and the Organization for European Economic Cooperation later replaced by organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, are significant economic organizations. The major defence organizations are the agencies, organs and committees created in implementation of the Dunkirk treaty, the Brussels treaty, the North Atlantic pact, and the Western European Union.

The new European organizations took over functions formerly handled through diplomatic channels, although diplomacy remained interwoven in many of their activities, especially so in the after month of September 11,2000.

The international agencies and institutions in Western Europe invented novel methods and forms for international business. Some institutions operate outside traditional diplomacy, and new diplomatic
bodies and practices have been rising around them. 31
In this respect, the organization for European
Economic Cooperation in particular has become a
trailblazer which has produced most useful results. 32

It was created by the convention for European
Economic Cooperation in 1948. The sixteen European
nations participated in the convention. West Germany
and Spin later became regular members. Canada and the
United States joined as associate members. Yugoslavia
was given the status of observer. The OEEC was an
'elaborate regional organization', especially in
matters of trade international payments and movements
of labour. Its economic cooperation program was made
possible by Marshall Plan Aid, which the American
Congress passed in 1948. The OEEC directed its
activities through the council, a Broad of Management
and an Executive Committee. The organization had many
special and technical committees.
The OEEC in 1961 was replaced by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The members of OECD are Austria, Belium, Canada, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States; and Finland and Yugoslavia are members with special status. Its aims are:

a) to achieve the highest sustainable economic growth and employment and a rising standard of living in member countries while maintaining financial stability, and thus to contribute to the development of the world economy;

b) to contribute to sound economic expansion in member as well as non member countries in the process of economic development;

c) to contribute to the expansion of world trade on a multilateral, non discriminatory basis in accordance
The organization of OECD consist of a council composed of representatives of all member states. The Executive Committee consists of ten members designated annually by the council.

The organization has a large Secretariat at Paris, headed by a Secretary General. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) is a major committee of the organization which seeks to aid less developed countries by increasing the volume of assistance provided by member countries and improving its overall efficiency by a better coordination of members aid efforts and policies.

The member states of Communities are Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and West Germany. Greece and Turkey are associated with the Communities with a view to eventual membership. The six nations forming Communities are often referred to as the 'Inner Six' or as 'Little Europe'. Three communities formed are the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), the European Economic Community
In 1954, an effort was made to form a European Defence Community. Another effort in progress relates to the formation of a European Political Community. The ultimate purpose of all of them is to contribute to "the political construction of Europe". Three existing communities have already paved the way for further integration.

Although the formation of a single European Community is still more a dream than a reality but the foundations have been well laid today they are working towards a commission constitution after the succeeding with the formation. Commenting on the Community of the six, Roger Massip has observed that some of the most encouraging results lie in the psychological sphere. Little by little, he says, the nation grouped in what it known as the six or little Europe, have become ware of the existence of higher interests and of the efficiency of an authority which
embraces those interests and which deserves to be respected and obeyed". It is "no exaggeration to say" he continues, "that European thinking has come out in favour of common action and has been, so to speak, tempered in the fire of that action". 35

The council of Europe is composed of seventeen European countries Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Greece (suspended) and the United Kingdom. It was created at Strasbourg in 1949. Its aims are to foster unity, to safeguard a common heritage, and to promote economic and social progress among the members based on the concepts of the rule of law and the recognition of human rights. Although it has rendered substantial services, it has not fulfilled the hopes of its founders'. It remains a vague aspiration instead of a living reality. 36 Its main organs are the Committee of Ministers and the Consultative Assembly.
The European Free Trade Association (EFTA) was created in 1960, when Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, signed the Stockholm Convention. EFTA is a free trade area and not a customs union. Its members are often called the outer seven. The object of EFTA is economic expansion through progressive elimination of tariffs and other restriction on the trade of manufactured goods between member states. It works through a Council of Ministers, a Consultative Council and a Secretariat in Geneva.

The North Atlantic Treaty was drawn up in 1949. It binds together the major states of the Atlantic community: the United States, Great Britain, France, West Germany, Canada, Italy, Portugal, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, the Benelux countries, Greece and Turkey. The contracting parties have agreed:

(a) to settle disputes between themselves peacefully;
(b) to try to strengthen their free institutions;
(c) to develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack;
(d) to consult whenever in the opinion of any of them the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of any one is threatened and
(e) to assist any nation which is the victim of aggression by such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed forces.

The structure of NATO mainly consist of a permanent Council and Secretariat. The Council is composed of representatives of all the member states. The council meets at the ministerial level two or three times a year, and once or twice a week at the level of permanent representatives. All decisions of the Council are taken unanimously. The council has set up many committees in the fields of information and cultural relations, armaments, infrastructure, emergency planning, food and agriculture, industrial raw materials, and manpower planning. The secretariat has major divisions of political affairs, economics and finance, and production and logistics, as well as
an office of the scientific adviser. The most important committee, supervising the work of the NATO military organization under the Permanent Council, is the Military Committee which is actively engaged in the cause to fight against terrorism.  

The NATO council has become instrument for continuous consultation. The consultation has become a daily process in which the skill of diplomats sometimes may be more important than the power of their respective countries. The consultation is used extensively and regularly. It has given rise to a new method of collective and consultative diplomacy. In the current trend to employ diplomacy backed by military, and consultation, to share information to counter terrorism.

The Diplomacy of African Integration.

As the Africans gained political independence, the leaders of many of the new African States began to talk in terms of African unity. Many proposals for
African regional associations were discussed from time to time, only a few have actually taken organizational form.

In 1958, delegates of eight African States—Ethiopia, Ghana, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, the Sudan, Tunisia, and the United Arab Republic—met in Accra. This was the first Conference of Independent African States (CIAS). The delegates agreed on the necessity for establishing 'machinery for consultation and cooperation'. Its second conference was held in 1960 at Addis Ababa. Some more African States attended it. The recommendations of the conference regarding the establishment of a council for African Economic Cooperation.

The most significant landmark in the field of consultative diplomacy among African states was the meeting together of thirty-one states at Addis Ababa.

The Addis Ababa Conference decided upon a basic charter which listed the goals of the new
Organizations freedom, dignity, and equality for all Africans continuation of the struggle against colonialism preservation and consolidation of the territorial integrity of the members and the establishment of common institutions. Latest addition to this in to discourage terrorism in any of the African States.

The Arab League and the Central Treaty Organization are two well developed regional arrangements in the Middle East A third, the Regional Cooperation for Development RCD is limited in its operations but may become increasingly important.

The plan of forming an Arab Union is not new. It is an idea which lived in the minds of the Arabs for centuries. In the age of Caliphs Umayyad and Abbasid dynasties, Islam was the real bond that connected different parts of the Empire. In the 19th century (1809-1840), there was an attempt by Mohammad Ali, the Turkish Ruler of Egypt, toward forming a political Arab Union. The plan did not succeed. Toward the end
of the 19th century and the beginning of 20th century a new Arab movement began. Sharif Hussain played a notable role. The Second World War stimulated the efforts towards the formation of Arab Union In October, 1944 the Arab countries signed the Alexandria protocol. In March, 1945, all the Arab countries signed the pact of the Arab League. Its members are Algeria, Iraq Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic, and Yemen. Its objectives are "to strengthen and consolidate the ties which would bind all Arab countries and direct them toward the general welfare of the Arab World to improve its conditions, insure its future and help realize its hopes and aspiration" The pact emphasized cooperation among the member states in economic and financial affairs, communications, cultural affairs, nationality and related matters, social affairs, and health problems. In its recent conference, the league has passed a resolution to counter all activities of terror in the name of fundamentalism.
The chief organ of the Arab League is the Council. It is composed of representatives of all member states. The League has set up several committees — political, legal, social, cultural, press and publicity, financial, etc. The permanent headquarters are at Cairo. The League has concluded formal agreements and informal arrangements with most of the specialized agencies of the UN.

The League has considerably helped in the promotion of the idea of Arab Union. The League members, in 1946, concluded a cultural treaty. The Arab Bank was set up in 1957. A collective security pact came into force in 1952. In 1961, an Economic Unity pact was signed. In 1965, the Arab Common Market was officially inaugurated. This Common Market is a significant regional arrangement in the Arab World. The League, ever since its inception has concentrated largely on political matters. Its special focus of attention being Palestine and the Jews. Palmer and Perkins observe "Too loose in organization, too much dominated by the U.A.R., too sharply divided by
political and personal rivalries, and too much a hostile coalition against Israeli, the Arab League has not been a strong regional arrangement. Nevertheless, it is a symbol of national revival in the Arab World, and it may herald a trend toward a larger political grouping in a strategically critical area.

Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). Developed from the Baghdad pact of mutual assistance of 1955 between Turkey and Iraq Pakistan, Iran and the United Kingdom subsequently acceded to the treaty Iraq withdrew in 1958, and the United States joined the pact in 1956. The organization provides a framework for bilateral defence agreements, and for agreements relating to economic cooperation.

The purpose of CENTO is to provide a common defence against an aggressor, and it is, of course, based upon the fear of Russian aggression. The United states has a deep interest in this objective. In 1958 Secretary of State Dulles, attended a Council meeting of the Organization, said, we whole heartedly support
the Baghdad pact, and he assured members that mobile power of great force would, as needed be brought to bear against any communist aggressor.

The institutions of CENTO are a Ministerial Council which meet annually and a permanent Council of Deputies which meets when necessary. It has special committees for military planning, economic cooperation, communications and counter subversion. The Secretariat is in Ankara headed by a Secretary General.

Regional Cooperation for Development (RCD). Iran, Turkey and Pakistan has set up a new regional organization, known as the Regional Cooperation for Development (RCD). Really "grew out of the association of these three muslim states in CENTO, but apparently it is regarded by its members as a separate organization". It has been styled by Pakistan as "the first example of regional cooperation among developing nations".
The notable evidences of regional cooperation in Asia and pacific area are a number of mutual security pacts, notably SEATO, the conferences sponsored by Asian Countries such as the Colombo powers, the Colombo Plan, the Asian and Pacific Council, and the Association of South East Asian Nation.

ASA, Maphilindo, and an Asian Common Market. In August 1961 the Malaya, Philippines and Thailand set up an Association of Southeast Asia, for the purpose of establishing a firm foundation for common action to further economic and social progress in southeast Asia. Its progress and work is slow and tardy.

Another organization known as Maphilindo, to promote closer cooperation between three countries Malaya the Philippines, and Indonesia was set up in August 1963. The kind of cooperation envisioned in the Maphilindo declaration has hardly been achieved.
In March, 1963, the President of Philippines advocated the establishment of an Asian regional economic organization51. The application of this idea seems remote.

The Colombo Plan. The plan originated from a recommendation by a conference of Commonwealth Foreign Ministers, convened in Colombo in January, 1950, to consider economic problems facing the new nations of south and South East Asia. A Consultative Committee was established to examine what assistance the area needed, and how countries outside the area could help. The plan was formally inaugurated on July, 195152.

The Colombo plan is an organization for the provision and coordination of mutual aid and technical assistance on a bilateral basis between countries of southern and eastern Asia. Afghanistan, Australia, Bhutan, Burama, Cambodia, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Laos, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Thailand, and South Vietnam also Canada,
Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). In 1954, the representatives of the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, and Pakistan met at Manila to consider measures for concerted resistance to possible aggression or subversion in Southeast Asia. Out of this emerged the Southeast Asia Collective Defence Treaty. The Treaty provides for mutual assistance in the event of aggression and the provision of assistance for social and economic projects. The Treaty also contains provisions for countering subversive activities from without.

The Organization works through a Council consisting of Foreign Ministers (normally meet annually), and of representatives meeting monthly in Bangkok. It has a big Military Planning Office.
SEATO is a 'weak regional defence system. Pakistan's decision to withdraw even in slow time, from the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization is realistic from the point of view of its own situation as well as in relation to the relevance and importance of SEATO in the world today. The organization has been unable to meet and check guerrilla insurgency wherever it has occurred in Southeast Asia.

Asian and Pacific Council (ASPAC). The Asian and Pacific Council was created in 1966 at Seoul. The members are Australia, Japan, Malaysia, Nationalist China, New Zealand, the Philippines, South Korea, South Vietnam, and Thailand. The objectives of the Organization are the promotion of economic cooperation and to preserve the integrity and sovereignty in the face of external threats. It is non-military non-ideological, and not anti-communist.

Association of South East Asian Nation (ASEAN). The Association of South East Asian Nations was
created in 1967, in the meeting of representatives between Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand at Bangkok. The Bangkok declaration stated that the objectives are to accelerate economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region and to promote regional peace and stability.

The South pacific commission. The South pacific Commission (SPC) is a regional body established under an agreement, signed at Canberra on 6 February, 1947, by representatives of the governments then administering territories in the area Australia, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States. (The Netherlands membership terminated on 31 December, 1962). Western Samoa was admitted to full membership of the Commission in 1964. The purpose of the commission is to encourage and strengthen international co-operation in promoting the economic and social welfare in the south pacific region. Its role is advisory and consultative it is concerned with
technical work and research in the fields of health, education, social development, agriculture and economic development.

The permanent headquarters of the Commission are at Noumea, New Calaedonia. The Commission consists of not more than two commissioners from each of the participating governments, assisted by alternates and advisers. It is advised by two auxiliary bodies, the Research council and the South pacific Conference. The chief officer of the Commission is the Secretary General who is appointed by the Commission. The other principal officers, also appointed by the commission, are the executive officers in the fields of health, social development and economic development. The Commission also has professional, administrative and general service personnel.

Consultative Diplomacy

Thus, in the new forms of diplomacy, namely, consultative diplomacy is visible. In the Councils
multilateral consultations take place and international political problems are collectively discussed. The Councils of NATO, OECD, CENTO, OAS, OAU, WTO, etc have become instruments for continuous consultations.

Diplomacy as an Instrument:

Thus, present day international environment is quite conducive for diplomacy. Diplomacy despite difficulties requires patient labors. With the rapid strides made in scientific knowledge and technology, mankind is now able to establish an affluent world beyond boards.

The present transformation of the social and political order is an extremely complex process. This is particularly true of relations among states. During this complex period of transition the aim of diplomacy should be to prevent conflicts of any kind that might cause irreparable damage to the human kind itself.
However, one should not take for granted the importance of diplomacy in maintaining peace and averting war. The current problem for us is to evaluate in the succeeding years as to how far diplomacy has been a proper instrument in maintaining peace and determining the relation between nations keeping in view the current course of world affairs especially in the post 11th September 2000 Scenario.

The outcome of diplomacy to a great extent depends upon the political, economic and military forces. All three are closely inter locked. The great change has been in economics. The economics and economic forces have drastically changed after the end of the Second War. Although economic considerations have always been present in diplomacy but today the emphasis has changed. The economic diplomacy has grown in dimensions during post world war II period. No small nation, and perhaps even no larger nation, can exist comfortably except as part of some large economic system. Ideally such a system should be world wide. The largest country like the United States,
today is trying to set up economic imperial system of a new kind.

A dominant branch of modern diplomacy which has emerged fairly recently is the economic diplomacy. However, the threat of Terrorism seem to engulf the nations around the world with its new overseers of vengeance. Countries despoiled by these acts need to reconstruct themselves especially so in the post 11 September 2000 spell. As a result Diplomacy now addresses itself to this series of problems, adding them to the traditional list of military, political and territorial questions.

As President Johnson had observed "we have also learned in this century, and we have learned it at painful and bloody cost, that our own freedom depends on the freedom of others, that our own protection requires that we help protect others, and that we draw increased strength from the strength of others. It is in the light of this situation that Diplomacy is seen as an instrument of anti terrorily policy and the
diplomatic movements between nations is seen as an act of rejuvenating diplomacy to prepare it for encountering new job requirements of sharing resources and information. Economic arrangements are a means to that end. Economics, national or international, indeed, is not an end in itself, but a means and a base upon which may be developed a more satisfying life for peoples and individuals.

A new diplomat in this context should be skilled in dealing with international exchange, of information’s international finance, and the machinery of security. He should be a negotiator, familiar with new terrorism of camouflaged war.

The new diplomacy, now, need insights and talents drawn from the great disciplines of the natural sciences and technology. Even though science and technology may not contribute to the rationale or to the major substance of diplomacy.
One cannot neglect them, except at grave peril. Although science and technology offer no sovereign remedies, easy panaceas, single, all embracing solutions, or omniscient talents, but they are the seed beds of a revolution sweeping the world. And diplomacy has largely become the creature of science and technology. The impact of science on diplomacy is deep and pervading. More so in a world ridden with Terrorism which is engaged in its activities using these medium of science and Technology to terrorize the world. From internet to international boundary their modus operandis is basically Science and Technology dependent.

James R. Killian mentions some principal ways in which science and technology are affecting relations among nations and the craft of diplomacy;

There is first the 'eclipse of distance' and the nearly instantaneous communication of events the world over. The technological effects are making the entire human community an interacting whole, a global
neighborhood, wherein almost all people find themselves involved together, their aspiration mutually stimulated and amplified and their tragedies, triumphs, tropism's and anxieties transmitted to all.

The second is the increasing velocity with which ideas are disseminated around the world and the swelling volume of information. Under these circumstance policy makers must take measures to avoid becoming swamped with information, to have the means to identify what is important for decision making, while at the same time they must be prepared under conditions of a compressed time scale, to cope with sudden squalls and fateful crises. Given the technological potential of surprise nuclear attack, they must also be prepared to make rapid decisions of profound, if not total, consequence.

And, thirdly, the political consequence of science are augmented by its transational character. Today, we see a complex of international scientific organizations that stand apart from the political
relations between government and are not restricted by the formal channels used by nations. In addition, there are private scientific transnational organizations, international programs of scientific cooperation, and in the U.S.A. alone many foreign scientific programs sponsored, or participated in, by the U.S. government agencies. With all these programs, the handling of scientific foreign relations has become an important component in American foreign policy.

The fourth aspect of science and technology which is important to foreign service officers has to do with the many ways in which the techniques of foreign relations have been affected. Technology has introduced a more sensitive dynamics into international relations. It has provided new diplomatic tools, as for example, in communications and travel. It has caused great shifts in the character and locus of the world’s strategic geography. Propaganda is amplified by electronics, and the leaders of one nation can appeal directly to the people of another. It has
provided new opportunities for achieving foreign policy objectives.

And, fifthly, as the rivalry among nations extends to outer space, the foreign service officer faces a host of new problems, including some in Newtonian physics and cosmology. He finds himself involved in tricky problems, transcending the international, frequency allocations for satellites, or the risk of man made contamination of the moon.

And, lastly, the achievement of political objectives can sometimes be furthered by directing scientific activities toward important political goals as for example, world health, agricultural advances, atoms for peace, the peaceful uses of outer space and world weather reporting and control. All of this requires new skills and an understanding of the subtle relations between technological and political ideals.
Thus, science is present in the foreign offices of the world. Any predictions about the future must necessarily take into account the possibilities of future technological breakthroughs.

The role of diplomacy in preserving the entire human society is greater today, than even before. This is because the impact of Terrorism world wide. In this direction the new techniques in diplomacy, Livingston Merchant mentions three main features improvements in the art of communications, impact of popular democracy on the conduct of diplomacy, and the widespread appearance of multilateral diplomacy. This in a way strengthens the arguments of James R. Killian.

A large segment of the business of international relations is conducted today through the medium of international conferences and the periodic meetings of international organizations. This is termed conference diplomacy. The term diplomacy by conference, in other words, is used to describe 'the frequent recourse to
multilateral method' by which nations are doing business with each other.

Today it is a technique of diplomatic negotiations and like all aspects of diplomacy is surrounded by numerous and complicated rules of procedure. With the Terrorist activities increasing around the world, the United Nations with its annual General Assembly and more frequent meetings of the Security council and other agencies to find a solution to the menace of terrorism has considerably expanded the dimensions of multilateral diplomacy.

The United Nations, to put it in a nutshell, has carried conference diplomacy a step further in the light of the Terrorist activities. Apart from the United Nations, the regional and other groupings of states, have also contributed to the growth of conference diplomacy. With a evolving focus on Anti Terrorist policies.
It is estimated that United Nations now sponsor more than five thousand meetings each year. The international negotiations have, therefore, become a heavy burden on the foreign ministers and other top policy makers.

Summit meetings are conferences of leading statesmen heads of states or governments able to make important political decisions and conclude agreements, possibly without ordinary governmental channels. Sir Winston Churchill coined the phrase in 1953.

Apart from the personal diplomacy by emperors, kings, princes, and prime ministers which goes back to antiquity. Professor Plischke calls attention to the fact that personal diplomacy was practiced by all those great men who have made history so far. The role of participating rulers and statesmen in the periodic congresses (1815-1822) the Congress of Paris (1856) and the Congress of Berlin (1873) was great he says. During the 1920s and early 1930s the leading statesmen approved personally some of the most important
political arrangements at conference. The major decisions affecting the course of World War II and post War international order were made during the several personal meetings between the big three Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin and the less frequent meetings of others leaders. The most publicized post war summit conference was held in Geneva in July 1955 attended by President Eisenhower (US) Sir Anthony Eden (Britain), Faure (France, and Bulganin and Khrushcheve (Russia). Although the Geneva summit could hardly solve the tangled problems of German reunification, European security, arms limitation and the related problems, but the words spoken at Geneva were "for the most part polite and smiles were emitted from time to time, those with an optimistic view of affairs referred to the Geneva spirits as the monumental accomplishment of the meeting.

Second effort to hold a similar conference in 1960 broke down on the eve of the scheduled opening. The Bandung conference 1955, and the conference of non aligned states in Belgrade in 1961 and in Cairo in
1964 are notable illustrations. The Tashkent summit conference attended by Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri India and President Aybu Khan Pakistan in January, 1966 through the good offices of Prime Minister Kosygin Soviet Union, has added to the dimensions of this new technique in international diplomacy. African Prime ministers and heads of states have frequently participated in conferences held under the auspices of the organization for African Unity. The May 1972 Moscow summit between President Nixon and Brezhnev was more symbolic than substantive. Brezhnev's visit to Washington in June 1973 for a second summit with President Nixon underlines the reality of the growing détente between the two super power. The examples of summit and near summit diplomacy are numerous. It has become increasingly common in recent years.

Some of the post war leaders, particularly Adenauer, de Gaulle, Macmillan, Eisenhower Kennedy, and of course Khrushchev, practiced personal diplomacy. Similar practices were made until recently.
by Clinton and Bush in view of the Palestinian problem.

Despite its drawbacks and pitfalls, summit diplomacy have become almost unavoidable in contemporary international policies. Especially in the light of the increasing Terrorist activities and the immediate attention it deserved.

The end of World War II brought fundamental changes in European politics. The emergence of super powers made Europe weak and small. Its historical states system was destroyed. Half of the continent passed under Soviet control. The expansion of the Soviet empire to central Europe, the loss of most overseas possessions, and the emergence of new power centers on the globe gave sudden strength to the slogan Europe, unite or perish. The complex international problems of post war Europe could not have been solved on the basis of traditional diplomatic practices. Imaginative western states man
ship invented new approaches and methods which are not to be found in the annals of traditional diplomacy.

The European states, as such, established coordinating bodies and regional organizations. The regional organizations are mainly of two types: economic and military. The inter-Scandinavian economic bodies, Franco-Italian and French-British economic groups, the Benelux union and the Organization for European Economic Cooperation later replaced by the organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, are significant economic organizations. The major defence organizations are the agencies, organs and committees created in implementation of the Dunkirk treaty, the Brussels treaty, the North Atlantic pact, and the Western European Union.

The new European organizations took over functions formerly handled through diplomatic Channels, although diplomacy remained interwoven in many of their activities. Especially so in the aftermath of September 11, 2000.
The ultimate purpose of all of them is to contributed to “the political construction of Europe”. Although the formation of a single European Community is still more a dream than a reality but the foundations have been well laid today they are working towards a commission constitution after the succeeding with coming currently.

The North Atlantic Treaty was drawn up in 1949. It binds together the major states of the Atlantic community the United states Great Britain, France West Germany, Canada, Italy, Portugal, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, the Benelux countries, Greece and Turkey.

The structure of NATO mainly consist of a permanent Council and Secretariat. The Council is composed of representatives of all the member states. The council meets at the ministerial level two or three times a year, and once or twice a week at the level of permanent representatives. All decisions of the council are taken unanimously. The council has set
up many committees in the fields of information and
cultural relations, armaments, infrastructure,
emergency planning, food and agriculture, industrial
raw materials, and manpower planning. The secretariat
has major divisions of political affairs, economics
and finance, and production and logistics, as well as
an office of the scientific adviser. The most
important committee, supervising the work of the NATO
military organization under the permanent council, is
the Military committee which is actively engaged in
the cause to fight against terrorism.

The NATO Council has become instrument for
continuous consultation. The consultation has become a
daily process in which the skill of diplomats
sometimes may be more important than the power of
their respective countries. The consultation is used
extensively and regularly. It has given rise to a new
method of collective and consultative diplomacy. In
the current trend to employ diplomacy backed by
military, and consultation, to share information to
counter terrorism, thus helps in formulations of
policies that can counter effecting the acts of terror by sharing experiences.

As the Africans gained political independence, the leaders of many of the new African States began to talk in terms of African unity. Many proposals for African regional associations were discussed from time to time, only a few have actually taken organizational form.

In 1958, delegates of eight African States—Ethiopia, Ghana, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, the Sudan, Tunisia, and the United Arab Republic—met in Accra. This was the first conference of Independent African States (CIAS). The delegates agreed on the necessity for establishing 'machinery for consultation and cooperation'.

The most significant landmark in the field of consultative diplomacy among African states was the meeting together of thirty-one states at Addis Ababa,
The Addis Ababa Conference decided upon a basic charter which listed the goals of the new organizations: freedom, dignity, and equality for all Africans, continuation of the struggle against colonialism, preservation and consolidation of the territorial integrity of the members, and the establishment of common institutions. Latest addition to this is to discover age terrorism in any of the African States and to counter it with the help of the west.

The Arab League and the Central Treaty Organization are two well-developed regional arrangements in the Middle East. A Third, the Regional Cooperation for Development (RCD) is limited in its operations but may become increasingly important in the fight against terrorism.

The plan of forming an Arab Union is not new. It is an idea which lived in the minds of the Arabs for centuries. In the age of Caliphs Umayyed and Abbasid dynasties, Islam was the real bond that connected
different parts of the Empire. In the 19th century (1809-1840), there was an attempt by Mohammad Ali, the Turkish Ruler of Egypt, toward forming a political Arab Union. The plan did not succeed. Toward the end of the 19th century and the beginning of 20th century a new Arab movement began. Sharif Hussain played a notable role. The second World War stimulated the efforts towards the formation of Arab Union. In October, 1944 the Arab countries signed the Alexandria protocol. In March, 1945, all the Arab countries signed the pact of the Arab League. Its members are Algeria, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic, and Yemen. Its objectives are "to strengthen and consolidate the ties which would bind all Arab countries and direct them toward the general welfare of the Arab World to improve its conditions, insure its future and help realize its hopes and aspiration" The pact emphasized cooperation among the member states in economic and financial affairs, communications, cultural affairs, nationality and related matters, social affairs, and health problems.
In its recent conference, the league has passed a resolution to counter all activities of terror in the name of fundamentalism.

Thus, in the new forms of diplomacy, namely, consultative diplomacy is visible. In the councils multilateral consultations take place and international political problems are collectively discussed. The councils of NATO, OECD, CENTO, OAS, OAU, WTO, etc have become instruments for continuous consultations.

In view of the dismal record of diplomacy from world war I through to world war II it was only natural that afterwards an attempt would be made to build on different foundations. The could war, and the Soviet threat that came with it, provided the foundations.

As the attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001 made painfully clear, the treaty designed to deter putative nuclear aggressors proved
notably ineffective in deterring genuine terrorists. Invoked both by the NMD's proponents as the cornerstone of world security that must be preserved, that quintessential Cold War treaty should best have been left alone as a relic of another era. Hence the diplomatic rejuvenation as a new deferent.

Thus, in the current context of all diplomatic movements either through individuals or through organizations what is certain in the central theme of Anti terrorist stand. Each nation by its own experiences of terror quickly looks up to the neighbor to improve their relations thing the diplomatic instrument to build among their neighborhood similar sentiments against terrorism to act untimely to fight the enemies of humanity. An attempt is made in this chapter to travel through the 20th century diplomatic forms to Identify this central aspect. Hence this chapter.
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