

OLD AND NEW DIPLOMACY AND THE ROLE OF COMMUNICATION

Fatih Mehmet SAYIN*
Betül Ayşe SAYIN**

ESKİ VE YENİ DİPLOMASİDE İLETİŐİMİN ROLÜ

Abstract

Diplomacy has been functioning as a political system since ancient times and regulates relations among states. Traditionally, diplomacy meant the conduct of relations between states through representatives using communication and negotiation on a bilateral basis (Lentner, 1997). The basis of diplomacy is communication of thoughts and ideas between the Governments of States and to an increasing ardent with international organizations and this can be affected directly between Heads of Government or indirectly through the intermediary of written correspondence or of an Ambassador (Feltham, 1982).

During in-state and inter-state relations, language is the major instrument for communication and to express the intent quoted by those who shape politics and international relations. While diplomacy has met changes throughout years, the importance of language and communication has not diminished, but increased with different needs.

Old and new diplomacy differs in some aspects of its practice depending on the change the world encounters. While communication, by means of it the language, is the basic element of diplomacy, its use and function has not changed but increased with the era of new and modern diplomacy.

Key Words: diplomacy, diplomatic relations, old and new diplomacy, modern diplomacy, communication, language.

Öz

Diplomasi gemiŐ zamanlardan beri siyasi bir sistem olarak varlıđını sürdürmekte ve devletlerarası iliŐkileri düzenlemektedir. Geleneksel tanımıyla

* Canik Basari University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, fmsayin@hotmail.com

** International Black Sea University, Faculty of Education, Georgia, Lecturer at Canik Basari University, aaltintop18@hotmail.com

diplomasi, temsilciler vasıtasıyla devletlerarası ilişkilerin iki taraflı iletişim ve görüşmelere dayalı olarak yürütülmesi anlamına gelmektedir (Lentner, 1997). Diplomasinin temeli, ülkelere ait hükümetler arasında ve artan uluslararası organizasyonlarca düşünce ve fikirlerin iletilmesidir ve bu iletişim de ya direkt olarak hükümetlerin başındakilerden veya dolaylı olarak yazışmalardan ya da elçilerin aracılığından etkilenmektedir (Feltham, 1982).

Ülke içi ve ülkeler arası ilişkilerde dil, iletişimin en önemli aracı durumundadır; siyaseti ve uluslararası ilişkileri şekillendirenlerin aktarmış oldukları niyetlerini ifade etmektedir. Diplomasinin yıllar geçtikçe değişikliklere maruz kalırken dilin ve iletişimin önemi azalmamış, aksine, farklı ihtiyaçlar dolayısıyla ehemmiyeti artmıştır.

Eski ve yeni diplomasi dünyadaki değişikliklere bağlı olarak uygulama açısından farklılık göstermektedir. İletişim ve iletişim vasıtasıyla dil, diplomasinin temel elemanıdır. Dilin kullanımı ve fonksiyonu değişmemekle beraber yeni ve modern diplomasi çağıyla birlikte artış göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Diplomasi, Diplomatik ilişkiler, eski ve yeni diplomasi, modern diplomasi, iletişim, dil.

1. Introduction

The term diplomacy reminds us the management of foreign relations on inter-national, inter-state or inter-continental basis. From this respect, it refers to international diplomacy, through which international relations is conducted on the issues of culture, economics, trade, war and peace. It also comprises international treaties conducted by the diplomats after negotiations. The elicitation of international relations mainly depends on diplomacy.

Diplomacy dominates a part of political life which concerns the destinies of the greatest number of millions of the human race. It controls a human relationship which has been, and still is, the most powerful and the most prolific of all in producing disasters and miseries; yet which could be, and ought to be, the most pregnant with blessings for each individual amongst these millions (Hayward, 1916).

Diplomacy has often been called an art because each situation requires a unique mixture of empathy, persuasion, bluster, and cajoling amongst other things. It is the practice of verbal discussion with the intent to influence, transmit a position or negotiate on a given issue or situation for a mutually acceptable outcome (Jennifer Aiken, 2005).

The technological advances in the last decades have ushered in the start of a communication age. This has been a significant tool for diplomacy and replaced 'hard power' uses with 'soft power' which is a new tool for more attractive relations. So, we see diplomacy as an improving field from past till present. Old and new diplomacy has some absolute and sharp differences; however while the communication as a tool was existing from the early diplomatic relations; it is especially during modern diplomatic uses that communication has become the major instrument for diplomacy.

Understanding the current place of diplomacy in its varying forms requires us to recognize that diplomacy has a long history and one that predates the 'modern' state-focused international system. Indeed, diplomacy as a set of practices, rules and procedures enabling regularized interaction and mediation between human collectivities has existed since the early days of humankind. At the most fundamental level, diplomacy has always concerned processes of mediation between 'us' and 'the other' (Numelin, 1950; Neumann, 2002), and the reconciliation of the impulses for separateness and community in international affairs (Batora, 2008). What is unchanged from past till present is the importance given to communication; whereas the need for communication and language has increased and acquired the form of an art with new diplomacy.

2. Nature of Diplomacy

As a number of scholarly works have shown diplomacy was conducted in various ways in the ancient Middle East (Cohen and Westbrook 2000), ancient China, ancient Greece, the Roman Empire and Byzantium (Hamilton and Langhorne 1995) and, indeed, in medieval Europe (Queller 1967, Anderson 1993) and renaissance Italy (Mattingly 1955), (Batora, 2008).

The nature of world requires diplomacy among states. Even the existence of more than one state in the world requires those states to come to an agreement under some certain circumstances and through diplomatic relations. Each state is obliged, by the very desire to control its own destiny as far as possible, to take account of the neighbors who impinge on its interests and those of its citizens, whatever it considers those interests to be. In more formal terms, members of a group of independent states are obliged to manage the consequences of the fact that they enjoy their interdependence not absolutely and in isolation but in a setting of interdependence (Watson, 1982). States should be aware of their

responsibilities with one another since they do not merely depend on themselves, but they are concerned with the whole environment surrounding them.

States which are aware that their domestic policies are affected by ‘everything that happens’ outside, are not content merely to observe one another at a distance, but they feel the need to enter into a dialogue. This dialogue between independent states – the machinery by which their governments conduct it, and the networks of promises, contracts, institutions and codes of conduct which develop out of it – is the substance of diplomacy (Watson, 1982). Each state has its own state system to reach diplomatic dialogue with other states. Where there is a shared cultural heritage, or at any rate common values and where the communities which compose the states in a system are engaged in active exchange of goods and ideas so that there is a high degree of interdependence (Bull, 1977).

Historically an effective multilateral diplomatic dialogue within a states system has required more than the chance coexistence of a plurality of independent states with entangled interests. In the past, sustained dialogues developed and flourished between groups of states in a circumscribed geographical area and with a history of close contacts. Their diplomatic dialogue was conducted, and the pursuit of their separate interests was mediated, in terms of the concepts of law, honor, morality and prudence which prevailed in that civilization. Even war was not indiscriminate violence: it was regulated by the rules of the system (Watson, 1982).

The twentieth century gives more chance to diplomatic dialogue which shapes the international relations. Diplomacy’s fate is bound up with the acceptance of political norms and rules of behavior which make international society a meaningful reality (Sofer, 1988). There is an intensifying search by independent states for areas of consent in which they can act together (that is, agree to adopt parallel policies) to solve common problems. As interdependence grows and the possibility of going it alone diminishes, the larger and more established states of the world are becoming more acutely aware of the need to collaborate. Here, we reach that the new diplomacy requires international bodies of experts and foreign offices who act as diplomatic agents. These international bodies direct the modern collective diplomacy. While the operation of diplomacy changes, it is still as much diplomacy as before (Watson, 1982).

3. Historical Overview of the Diplomacy Development

The ability to practice diplomacy is one of the defining elements of a state, and diplomacy has been practiced since the formation of the first city-states. (GNU Free Documentation License) Diplomatic relations correspond to an intermediate stage in the general growth of mankind into a world state. The major implications of this are that diplomacy must have come into existence at a point where interdependence between nations or city-states got beyond a certain threshold so that some institution was needed to stabilize the relationship and make it more predictable (Ruge J. G., 1965).

It is instructive to note that right from the beginning, diplomacy, even in its crudest forms, evolved in response to political needs reciprocally felt. It has continued and is continuing thus until today and we shall shortly look at some outstanding and complex examples of the process in action. Once diplomacy actually existed and was conceded to be irreplaceably useful, a reverse factor also became possible. The nature and functioning of the diplomatic machine at any particular historical moment could of itself shape the way in which principals - whoever they might be - conducted their exchanges. Thus it has occasionally occurred that functions which had developed within diplomacy came to create a particular international activity simply because they existed (Langhorne, History and the Evolution of Diplomacy, 1998).

Diplomacy is as old as recorded history and almost certainly even predates it. Because of the economic and political world dominance of Europe and European-heritage countries for the past several centuries, a great deal of modern diplomatic practice can be traced from its origins in the Greek city-states through its evolution in the diplomatic practices of Rome, Byzantium, the Italian city-states, France, and nineteenth century Europe. This historical review will bring us to about World War I, which marks the transition from the “old” to the “new” diplomacy (Rourke, 1995).

With an ancient tradition dating to practice in India, China and Egypt, diplomacy achieved a formalized method developed by the Greeks, who also created the concept of immunity for diplomatic personnel. After a decline in the Middle Ages and a resurgence in the Renaissance, diplomacy reached its highest period of development in the nation-state system, and rules of precedent and procedure were formalized at the Congress of Vienna in 1815. As the world changed, effects were felt in diplomacy (Lentner, 1997).

4. Modern Diplomacy

Modern diplomacy's origins are often traced to the states of Northern Italy in the early Renaissance, with the first embassies being established in the thirteenth century. The practice spread from Italy to the other European powers. Milan was the first to send a representative to the court of France in 1455. Soon all the major European powers were exchanging representatives. Many of the conventions of modern diplomacy developed during this period. The top rank of representatives was an ambassador. The elements of modern diplomacy slowly spread to Eastern Europe and arrived in Russia by the early eighteenth century. The entire system was greatly disrupted by the French Revolution and the subsequent years of warfare. Napoleon also refused to acknowledge diplomatic immunity, imprisoning several British diplomats accused of scheming against France. He had no patience for the often slow moving process of formal diplomacy. After the fall of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna of 1815 established an international system of diplomatic rank. Disputes on precedence among nations (and the appropriate diplomatic ranks used) persisted for over a century until after World War II, when the rank of ambassador became the norm (GNU Free Documentation License).

At the end of 18th century, the French Revolution, France's efforts to export it, and Napoleon's attempt to conquer the continent shook Europe's state system. (Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1995) The nineteenth century was the end of the old style diplomacy. Kings and emperors still held sway, but the American and French Revolutions signaled the onset of the decline of that system of diplomacy characterized by Eurocentrism, great-power status, executive control, elite conduct, secrecy, and bilateral negotiations (Nicholson, 1979:43).

Although diplomatic practice has evolved slowly, the World War I (1914-1918) era serves as a benchmark in the transition to modern diplomacy. It was the beginning of the end of European world dominance. It also marked the fall of the German, Austrian, Ottoman, and Russian emperors. Nationalistic self-determination stirred strongly in Europe and other parts of the world. New powers – the United States, Japan, and China – began to assert themselves and they joined or replaced the declining European countries as world powers. The “old diplomacy” did not vanish, but it changed substantially. The “new diplomacy” includes seven characteristics: expanded geographic scope, multilateral diplomacy, parliamentarianism, democratization, open diplomacy, leader-to-leader diplomacy, and public diplomacy. These new practices have been greeted

as “reforms”, but many also have drawbacks (Rourke, *International Politics on the World Stage*, 1998).

The Peace Conference in Paris was the beginning of high level multilateral diplomacy, where English rapidly became the second working language alongside French. Politicians became increasingly active on the diplomatic floor and career diplomats were required to understand such complex matters as international economic and financial relations, arms control and disarmament, regulation of international transport, and communications. Diplomats were more often recruited for their professional competence than for their social background. Female diplomats made their first timid appearance and gradually occupied a growing percentage of diplomatic positions. Loyalty to a country’s ideology became an essential element. The use of force as a means of conducting a country’s external relations was restricted and eventually prohibited, thus giving diplomacy a theoretical monopoly. Bilateralism increasingly gave way to multilateralism and multilateral relations now tended to be conducted within the framework of international organizations with either general or specialized competencies. In the latter case, diplomats were no longer necessarily members of a country’s foreign service but could be representatives of specialized government agencies.

The last decades of this century have witnessed an even more profound transformation of diplomacy. The barrier of sovereignty, which protected states against interference in their internal affairs by other states or international bodies, has begun to crumble. Diplomatic activities often take place outside the traditional framework of conference rooms and consist of getting involved with ordinary people at all levels. Information technology (IT) and the Internet are overcoming distance and making continuous contact with all segments of one’s own diplomatic establishment as well as with international institutions feasible. Information technology also frees the diplomat from a lot of routine work and enormously enlarges his capacity for action, while leaving him free to concentrate on his core duty: to establish and maintain personal contacts and relations. It is this new revolution that will shape the diplomacy of tomorrow (Kappeler, *Diplomacy of Tomorrow: New Developments, New Methods*, 1998).

5. “Old” and “New” Diplomacy

While the communities evolve throughout the history, the politics and diplomacy evolves in its way that it is conducted, too. Yet its main features remain same; that is the management of relation between states. In 1815, 1918, and the early 1960s, diplomatic protocol was formulated and modified by the international community. In 1815 and 1918 these changes followed wars which altered the balance of power and the nature of European society. While 1815 established the foundations of nineteenth century statesmanship, building on diplomacy’s past achievements, 1918 constituted an endeavor to fashion a new diplomacy on the basis of a utopian and revolutionary vision.

The concept of new diplomacy was not a product of the deficiencies of the diplomatic method; rather, it was precipitated by the crisis in the system of the European balance of power that elevated the United States and the Soviet Union to prominence (Sofer, 1988). According to Morgenthau, Woodrow Wilson is the most eloquent apostle of the new diplomacy of the League of Nations. It is true that sometimes Wilson seemed to join hands with the opponents of any diplomacy whatsoever, as when he wrote in his letter to Senator Hitchcock of March 8, 1920, “For my own part, I am not willing to trust to the council of diplomats the working out of any salvation of the world from the things which it has suffered.” However, he saw clearly than anybody else the intimate connection between the new conceptions of international affairs as embodied in the League of Nations and a new diplomatic technique by which that new conception was to be realized.

The preamble to, and the first of, the Fourteen Points are still the most persuasive statement of the new philosophy of international affairs (Morgenthau, 1946). In the first point, he reads “Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.” (Wilson, 1918) Thus, the former Secretary of State, Corder Hull, said on his return from the Moscow Conference that the new international organization would mean the end of power politics and usher in a new era of international collaboration. The traditional diplomacy, here, act as cement for the successful operation of new diplomacy. The dualism of both is necessary to come to clear conclusion.

The first diplomatic document, which was discovered in the 1970’s, dates back to around 2500 BC. The antiquity attributed to this demonstrates

that diplomacy is not a new discipline. However, as in every discipline, change occurs, and so diplomacy has changed. Traditional diplomacy bases on bilateral relations, with only two parts involved. What is characteristic for the “new” diplomacy is that the negotiations and talks aren’t bilateral anymore; they became more open and involving more actors. Diplomacy today is usually not practiced between a selected few, but rather multilaterally. This may be due to the changing nature of international relations; many new important issues on the agenda, such as the environment, which affects us all and requires global cooperation and discussion.

The new diplomacy would bring about disarmament, free trade, and self-determination (Mayer, 1959). No persuasive explanation was forwarded for the long period of peace in Europe secured by the balance of power system and ‘secret’ diplomacy. The offensive against the old diplomacy failed to focus on the real causes of the First World War; at most, it was an assault on one of its byproducts.

Ideology has been regarded as both incompatible with diplomacy and one of the elements of change in the structure and style of the post-1919 European diplomacy. The inter-war period is portrayed as a series of master plans directed by totalitarian powers, eventually rendering Europe an ideological battlefield. In fact, ideology played a secondary role in amending the style and practice of professional diplomacy. The content and style of inter-war diplomacy underwent a metamorphosis, but its organizations and proceedings withheld the change (Sofer, 1988).

Certainly modern is a lot more complex compared to the old, high political issues concerned diplomacy. In the current era of rapid globalization, the technological revolution has become a tool towards greater success of the diplomatic process. And thanks to that, it proves much easier for diplomats to exchange information via telephone, internet, and virtual conferences without the need of physically coming together. But this, on the other hand, raises the question whether the tools of globalization actually tend to undermine the role of the old diplomatic institutions such as embassies. Mr. PerAugustsson, Deputy Chief of Mission in the embassy of Sweden, stated ‘if you want to negotiate with a state, you need to physically be based in the country itself, and have specific knowledge of the political and social life of this particular state’.

Other important issue in the subject of diplomacy is the relation between ‘open’ and ‘secret’ way of conducting diplomacy. Although the ‘new’ diplomacy is widely associated with openness and transparency, many

diplomatic activities are still often conducted in secret way which was developed by the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, and on bilateral 'old' diplomacy bases and they are mainly in regards of high political issues, such as state security matters. Despite the fact that the new diplomacy can seem to be highly transparent, there are still secrets and as the former British foreign minister Robin Cook among others said the most of the negotiations are done during breaks and behind closed doors. This fact can be further supported for instance when Tony Blair visited George Bush's ranch before the invasion of Iraq and then he became suddenly a staunch supporter of the invasion or the dubious arguments behind the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan. In some other aspects, such as environmental, trade and finance issues, multilateralism has increasingly developed conference agreement framework (T.Rourke, 1995).

There is a significant change of governments in terms of regulating the lives of their citizens. Governments now are providing the security of their citizens as well as their social and economic well-being. One of the most important changes in agenda in the diplomacy was the avoidance of war, which became a priority of the new diplomacy. Furthermore, the new diplomacy is considering the new issues in international relations: the environment, technology and arms control.

According to Harold Nicolson's analysis, written in 1961 in Foreign Affairs on the theme 'Diplomacy then and now' is colored especially by the impact of the Cold War... (Bartson, 2006, 4). (Augustin, 2010). From the end of the nineteenth century until the mid-1920s, the foreign ministries of the major European countries underwent organizational reform, serving as a model for other states. This trend gradually faded out, ostensibly due to the economic crisis. It was not, however, necessarily the by-product of a new conception of the nature of diplomacy.

Throughout the ages, the main functions of diplomacy have remained the same. As Zara Steiner notes: "despite differences, the older forms proved to be surprisingly resistant to change." So, it would not be surprising if this era was to be characterized not as the age of diplomacy's decline, but as the century of diplomacy (Sofer, 1988).

Together with the rise of diplomacy currently, we see that the importance of communication has risen, too and this has functioned as another aspect of new diplomacy with verbal utterances and importance of language and communication.

6. Diplomacy as Medium of Communication

Since diplomacy is a necessity for cross-cultural understanding in the foreign relations among states, communication undertakes a vital importance to fulfill this duty and acts as a mediator in diplomatic relations. Diplomacy attempts to manage the goals of foreign policy, mostly by implementing goals but also by preparing foreign policy decisions. As an institution that is a pattern of behavior, diplomacy is based on an established body of rules and practices for communication (Neumann, 2002). The communication paradigm makes the institution of diplomacy comprehensible (Berridge, 2002). At first, the readiness to communicate must be declared. This is done by establishing diplomatic relations or becoming a member of an IGO. Since diplomacy is basically an inter-subjective interaction and the artificial man, the state, and his little brother, the international governmental organization, cannot speak; persons must be designated who do the talking. Therefore, bilateral ambassadors are accredited, and the appointments of other diplomats are notified. Diplomats receive their instructions from governments, but they do not represent governments, but states (Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 1961). A country is not obliged to accept the person nominated by the sending state as interlocutor. Even after it has accepted a diplomat, the receiving state can at any time and without explanation declare a diplomat *persona non grata*. The diplomat is the one who has direct contact with the foreign partner. Diplomats do not only talk to official agents of the host state but to a variety of people and organizations. The official agent has been the backbone of diplomacy from the earliest times in recorded diplomatic history (Cohen, Reflections on the New Global Diplomacy: Statecraft 2500 BC to 2000 AD, 1999) Diplomatic communication does not derive from conscious operational codes but from social factors of which the individual diplomat is either unaware or over which he has no control (Keller, 1956).

There are two aspects of communication in diplomacy: one refers to the technical side of knowing the symbols used by others so that cognitive contact can be established. As is well known great stress is laid on this in the training of diplomats (Keller, 1956). For communication language is crucial. Therefore, the knowledge of foreign languages, preferably proficiency, is important for diplomats. If a diplomat does not speak the language of the counterpart they can choose a third language. Latin, and since the middle of the 18th century, French served as lingua franca of European diplomacy. At present English is the most frequently used working language of diplomacy. If joint documents such as treaties are

set up, a prior agreement about the language to be used must be reached. Furthermore, it has to be stipulated which text is authoritative. International governmental organizations must decide which languages they use as official and working languages. Often professional linguistic assistance is needed. Translators and interpreters contribute crucially so that diplomacy can fulfill its function of making communication between states and their agents possible. The words and style, which diplomats use, depend on the situation that they face. Sometimes diplomats have precise instructions about which language to use or to avoid. The forms of diplomatic correspondence practices have been developed. Chiefs of mission correspond with the foreign minister of the host country by formal notes written in the first person. Diplomatic missions correspond with foreign ministries by notes verbales written in the third person. Aide-memoires, bouts de papier, memoranda, non-papers and all types of letters offer a rich choice for diplomatic correspondence. In spite of the many calls for open diplomacy the confidentiality of diplomatic negotiations has survived since it alone guarantees to exclude interventions from outside and a loss of face for the partner who has made concessions. Those few rules of protocol that have survived up to now, such as those for receiving of a new ambassador, state visits, using titles, making calls or seating arrangements, are thought to show respect or to facilitate interaction.

The other refers to the emotional reaction to what has been said or written, to agreement not on what the symbols are but on what feelings they evoke. As described before in its definition, diplomacy depends on communication to denote the transmission of messages, impressions and interpretations from one human source to another (Keller, 1956). Once a message has been physically received, it still has to be comprehended – and comprehension is a matter of psychology, not mechanics. The meaning that a person attaches to the words received will come from his own mind. His interpretation is determined by his own frame of reference, his ideas, interests, past experiences, etc. – just as much as the meaning of the original message is fundamentally determined by the sender's mind, his frame of reference. All participants in a diplomatic process use language not only for national but also for global communication. They must be willing to compromise (Bolewski, 1963). Diplomats are servants of the state; their message is the communication itself that affect the foreign policy understanding.

We see that diplomats were major figures of diplomacy more in the past than present. That was requiring the use of a common language among

states. For that reason different languages have functioned as lingua franca at different times to foster communication. In old diplomacy we see that diplomats were both using a symbolic language and also evoked emotional feelings through their speeches. They could have the role of an assistant of the head of state and their ideas were taken into consideration. In new diplomatic relations, however, politicians have taken this role and diplomats have a more formal role.

When we consider other major changes from past till present, we see that the way of communication has changed, too. Technological changes, open and secret diplomacy forms and soft power use have affected the way communication is conducted in the new diplomacy. While the written documents were more common in old type, currently we see politicians on TV broadcast and every word and sentence they utter gain importance in new diplomacy.

In written texts which are also part of both old and new diplomacy as a form of communication, we meet some alterations among past and present forms. For all texts that are meant to be shared with another party or other parties, there are traditional requirements of polite formulations. On the other hand, internal documents only follow the rules of the entity which employs them. For countries long active in international diplomacy, there used to be all sorts of regulations regarding the writing of dispatches, instructions, briefs, reports, etc. New forms and means of communicating have affected the manner in which documents of diplomacy are written today, be they internal or addressed to one or more external entities. If we give an example, today, many treaties use simplified titles and mention of parties and omit the names of representatives altogether except at the bottom of the last page where the signatures have to be affixed (Kappeler, 2001).

Another aspect of modern communication comprises the use of hypertext documents as well. Hypertext allows the organization of diplomatic documents and this system has become common with the use of internet.

Diplomatic negotiation has also been part of diplomatic communication since ancient times. It is considered as a kind of art of speech recently and requires using the language in a creative way in order to have an impact over the other side. Diplomatic negotiations between states may encompass a great number of political, economic and technological issues such as energy, food, raw material, resources, trade and technology transfer. These issues have been part of international and diplomatic concerns as well as domestic affairs (El-Gammal).

These changes has not separated diplomacy from its roots but added a new shape to diplomacy and diplomatic relations. Both in old and new diplomacy, communication was treated as a crucial tool to reach consensus. Political needs of states positively altered the use of communication and improved it. At least, the use of soft power forced nations to be more communicative in relations.

Conclusion

Old and new diplomacy are tied to each other and interconnected in which the old diplomacy serves as a transmitter and passes the past processes and uses to the modern world. New diplomacy is modernized with all its aspects and has become much more regularized. Even though political relations still functions with their utmost tension among world states, diplomacy preserves to moderate relations with its own accepted rules. And this function is fulfilled through communication and with the use of diplomatic language.

Language in diplomacy provides exchange of ideas that are not culture-bound but easy adaptable to global and technological developments. It is the most essential tool for communication and for cross-cultural relations. With some differences but with the same purpose, both old and new diplomacy uses language and depends on communication.

With the new diplomatic needs, communication has gained importance and technological changes brought improvements in the format of written and verbal communication. We also see a new tool called as hypertext documents which is an internet based reference system. Besides, diplomatic negotiation has become more essential with the transfer of hard power of old diplomacy into soft power. All these changes positively affected the new face of modern diplomacy and increased the importance of communication.

References

- Augustin. (2010, February 23). *The New Diplomacy 2010 D*. Retrieved April 27, 2011, from <http://newdiplomacy2010d.blogspot.com/2010/02/changing-nature-of-diplomacy-bartson.html>
- Batora, J. a. (2008). Bilateral Diplomacy in the European Union: Towards 'post-modern' patterns? In V. D. Huijgh (Ed.), *Discussion*

- Papers in Diplomacy* (p. 28). Netherlands Institute of International Relations "Clingendael".
- Berridge, G. R. (2002). *Diplomacy, Theory and Practice*. 1-3.
- Bolewski, W. (1963). *Diplomatic Processes and Cultural Variations: The Relevance of Culture in Diplomacy*.
- Bull, H. (1977). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cohen, R. (1999). Reflections on the New Global Diplomacy: Statecraft 2500 BC to 2000 AD. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *Innovation in Diplomatic Practice*. New York.
- El-Gammal, A. M. *Diplomatic Negotiation*. Egypt, Cairo: Institute for Diplomatic Studies.
- Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. (1995). *Diplomacy*.
- Feltham, R. (1982). *Diplomatic Handbook* (4th ed.). London and New York: Longman.
- GNU Free Documentation License. (n.d.). *ediplomat.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.ediplomat.com/nd/history.htm>.
- Hayward, C. W. (1916). *What is Diplomacy?* (2008 ed.). London: G.Richards Ltd.
- Jennifer Aiken, E. B. (2005, January). *beyondintractability.org*. Retrieved from <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/Diplomacy--Intro/>.
- Kappeler, D. (1998). *Diplomacy of Tomorrow: New Developments, New Methods*. In A. T. Institute, *Modern Diplomacy* (p. 49). DiploPublishing.
- Kappeler, D. (2001). *Texts in Diplomacy*. In H. S. Jovan Kurbalija (Ed.), *Language and Diplomacy* (pp. 201-206). Diplo Projects.
- Keller, S. (1956). *Diplomacy and Communication*. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 20 (1), 176-182.
- Langhorne, R. (1998). *History and the Evolution of Diplomacy*. In A. T. Institute, *Modern Diplomacy*. Diplo Publishing.
- Lentner, H. H. (1997). *International Politics: Theory and Practice*. (M. Taylor, Ed.) USA: West Publishing Co.
- Mayer, A. J. (1959). *Political Origins of New Diplomacy, 1917-1918*. Yale University Press.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1946). *Scientific Man vs. Power Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Rourke, J. T. (1995). *International Politics on the World Stage* (5th ed.). Dushkin Publishing Group.
- Rourke, J. T. (1998). *International Politics on the World Stage*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Ruge, J. G. (1965). *Patterns of Diplomacy: A Study of Recruitment and Career Patterns in Norwegian Diplomacy*. Oslo: Peace Research Institute.
- Sofer, S. (1988). Old and New Diplomacy: A Debate Revisited. *Review of International Studies*, 14 (3), 195-211.
- Watson, A. (1982). *Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between States*. London: Eyre Methuen Ltd.
- Wilson, W. (1918, January 8). *History of the Relaxed Historian*. Retrieved April 27, 2011, from [www.emersonkent.com: http://www.emersonkent.com/speeches/the_fourteen_points.htm](http://www.emersonkent.com/speeches/the_fourteen_points.htm)