

DIPLOMATIC LAW AND PRACTICE OF DIPLOMACY IN A NEW GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES^{1*}

Abstract

In the new world order, diplomatic law and practice of diplomacy is facing challenges, shifting power structures, and diffusing information. In this respect, diplomatic strategies are evolving with new realities, taking cognizance of globalization, new technologies, information, conflicts and other social problems confronting the States. The objective of this paper is to assess the impact of new global changes in the conduct diplomatic relation among States. Its aim is also to situate diplomatic practice of the new era with the new influence and sophistication of cities and the force of democracy. In doing this, the paper adopts doctrinal methodology of research which takes insider view of diplomatic law and the fact that law cannot be studied in isolation. As the world has become a global village, the spread of culture, education and increase in media outlets, diplomatic law and practice has changed. The paper concludes that the orthodox methods of conducting diplomatic relation between and among states have been infected by changing world realities hence the need to reorder priorities. It recommends the training and re-training of diplomats to adapt to changing situations. The States also have to formulate policies that recognize today's security problems; more democratic world and keep on adjusting to the dictates of ever changing environment.

Keywords: Diplomacy, Diplomatic Law, Global Environment

1. Introduction

The growing worldwide integration has produced a whole series of consequences in economic relation, political alliance, cultural and environmental spillovers. Unfortunately, some of these consequences affect diplomacy and practice of diplomatic relations between and among states. Some consequences can be negative thereby shifting the paradigm of diplomacy. The spread of democratic practices, cultural influences, has meant that foreign leaders also have leeway than in the past to conduct diplomatic relation. Therefore in discussing exchange of diplomatic programmes and international relations theories and practice, the multiplier effect of their roles abroad deserve serious attention of opinion leaders, diplomats and foreign ministers in view of ever changing world. It is in recognition of this development in the present world order that this paper sets to examine how these developments affect or have affected diplomatic law and practice of diplomacy in new world order.

2. Meaning of Diplomacy and Diplomatic Relations

The term diplomacy is derived from Greek word 'diploma' which means 'a certificate' and it refers to the official documents carried by the messenger. It also means 'other official documents, that is, treaties', and this definition expanded when human activities. Those who deal with these documents are said to belong to res diplomatique or diplomatic business. From these antecedents gradually the word 'diplomacy' came to be related with the management of international relations, and those who managed them came to be regarded as 'diplomats'. According to Enerst Satow, Burke used the word 'diplomacy' to signify skill or success in advancing the interests of the state as far as practicable through peaceful means. Hence, maintenance of peace without injuring state interest is a major aim of diplomacy. But if peaceful means fail to safeguard the national interest force may be employed. Diplomacy is closely connected with the aims of foreign policy of the state concerned. It is very difficult to define diplomacy in clear cut terms. We can only try to frame a definition of the term diplomacy. It is the art of forwarding the interests of a state through negotiation and peaceful means, if possible, in relation to other states. If pacific means fail to obtain the desired objective, diplomacy permits to take resort to threat or actual use of force as a means to achieve its ends. A state diplomacy will also have to undergo necessary transformation to serve the national interest in the changing conditions thus may deviate from its originally conceived definition. Tracing the origin and meaning of diplomacy, Oppenheim states that it is a metamorphosed form of the precedent in the process of relations inherited from some ancient state and civilization. He noted that:

Legation as an institution for the purpose of negotiation between different states is as old history whose records are full of examples of legation sent and received by the oldest nations. And it is remarkable that even in antiquity where no such law as the modern international law was known, ambassadors everywhere enjoyed a special protection and certain privileges, although not by law but by religion,

¹ *By **Chukwuka ONYEAKU, LLB, LLM, M.Sc., MA., Ph.D., PGDE, ACIS, ACTI, BL**, Research Fellow, National Institute for Legislative and Democratic Studies, National Assembly, No.14/18 Danube Street Maitama Abuja, 08037120985, onyeaku@yahoo.com

ONYEAKU: Diplomatic Law And Practice Of Diplomacy In A New Global Environment: Challenges And Opportunities

ambassadors are looked upon as sacrosanct.²By and large, the classical definition of diplomacy is 'the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between governments of independent states.'³

In the conduct of diplomatic relation, governments may seek different types of agreements through negotiations to protect their interest. Four kinds of such agreements are identified which reflect different ways in which states act to regulate their relations. They are: (i) Extension Agreement which provides a formal ratification and continuation of existing arrangements. Examples are extension of tariff agreements and renewal of overseas base rights; (ii) Normalization Agreements that terminate an abnormal situation in relations between two or more parties. Diplomatic relations may be re-established, embargoes, trade wars ended, or cease fire put in effect; (iii) Redistribution agreements which benefit one side at the expense of the other. Examples are changes in territorial boundaries, in share of markets, degree of political influence in third areas, and in financial contributions to bilateral or multilateral organizations; Innovation agreements that set up new arrangements or undertaking that benefit both parties (though not necessarily equally). They include the treaties that established the European Economic Community, the Economic Community of West African States, The International Atomic Energy Agency, and the Austrian State Treaty of 1955 that established an independent but neutral state in place of the four-power occupation; the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in 1947 that paved the way for tariff reductions and elimination of other barriers to trade; and the Green Tree Agreement of 2003 between Nigeria and Cameroun that transferred Bakasi Island in Cross River State to Cameroun following the World Court Judgment in 2002 in favour of Cameroun.

During negotiations and diplomatic intercourse, procedural arrangements and agenda-setting play vital role. Before substantive negotiations begin, and before the sides commit themselves to enter into them, the actors must agree on a time, place, agenda and other modalities such as conference arrangements and the diplomatic level (that is, foreign ministers, ambassadors, or lesser diplomatic officials) at which the discussion will be held. Any of these procedural matters may itself generate disagreement. Indeed procedural wrangling may be an ominous sign of how far apart the two sides are on the substantive issues or reflect hostility and lack of trust. One side may also deliberately use procedural disagreements for tactical purposes so as to achieve side effects such as propaganda advantages, to demonstrate toughness and resolve, to extract concessions, or to gain negotiating advantages. In modern diplomacy, the tenacity with states argue over procedural matters has taken a new dimensions. Changing realities of the modern world have displaced ideological and other differences and interest that facilitated diplomatic processes in the European system. Globalization has altered the means and methods of conducting diplomacy as states now share economic, political, social, cultural and environmental problems alike. There is no longer much reliance on national interest as a factor to achieve diplomatic advantage because the world is now a global village. The phenomenal increases in the scope and volume of interstate relations brought about by global changes have led to increase in the functions of diplomats of 21st century. However, Article 3 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic intercourse and immunities lists the functions of a diplomatic mission as follows:

- (a) Representing the sending State in the receiving State;
- (b) Protecting in the receiving State the interests of the s State and of its national, within the limits permitted by international law;
- (c) Negotiating with the Government of the receiving State;
- (d) Ascertaining by all lawful means, conditions and development in the receiving State, and reporting thereon to the government of the sending State; and
- (e) Promoting friendly relations between the sending State and the receiving State, and developing their economic, cultural and scientific relations.⁴

These functions are divided into four categories namely: representation; negotiation; information and protection of national interests and subject. Among these, information is more crucial (though others are equally very fundamental). The success of a diplomat will largely depend on the quality of his information and its analysis. These in themselves depend upon the scope and sources of the information at his disposal. The relationship which he has cultivated with various sections of the society especially pressmen, government officials and the civil society, will

² Oppenheim, *International Law*, (vol.1), London, (Sweet and Maxwell, 1955), 769

³ Quoted in Harold Nicolson, 'The Old and New Diplomacy', in *Politics and the International System* (2nded.) Philadelphia, (Lippincott 1972), 425

⁴ Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic Relation 1961, Article 3 (1-V)

affect the scope and variety of his information. The Vienna Convention specifically prohibits the use espionage to obtain data and information.⁵ In practice, however, it is almost a routine for the States to send spies out under the diplomatic cover, but once they are discovered, they are declared persona non grata by the receiving State. From earliest times, an aura of intrigue and conspiracy surrounded diplomats and diplomatic practice. Sir Henry Wootton, ambassador of James I to the Court of Venice, said that an ambassador was ‘an honest man sent to lie abroad for the good of his country’.⁶ This is exactly the position of Abraham de Wicquefort, who coined the definition of the diplomat as ‘an honourable spy’ sent abroad to do espionage job.⁷ For this reason, morality is, in any case, an irrelevant consideration in diplomacy; a country could afford to be served bad men, but not by incompetent ones. Diplomacy is a cold and rational business, not to be practiced by the moralists, or the enthusiast, or the man with a low boiling point. The same point was made in the most famous of the eighteenth-century essays on diplomacy, Francois de Calliers’s in which he said persons interested in the career of diplomacy must consider whether they were born with ‘the qualities necessary for success.’⁸ These, the author wrote, included an observant mind, a spirit of application which refuses to be distracted by pleasures or frivolous amusements, a sound judgment which takes the measure of things as they are, and which goes straight to its goal by the shortest and most neutral paths without wandering into useless refinements and subtleties which as a rule only succeed in repelling those with whom one is dealing.

Above all Callieres observed that to succeed in the course of diplomatic assignment, the diplomat must have sufficient control over himself to resist the longing to speak before he has really thought what he shall say. He should not endeavor to gain the reputation of being able to reply immediately and without premeditation to every proposition which is made, and he should take a special care not to fall into the error of on famous foreign ambassador of our time who so loved an argument that each time he warm up in controversy he revealed important secrets in order to support his opinion. Perhaps the most descriptive feature of Calliere’s treatise was the passion with which he argued that a nation’s foreign relations should be conducted by persons trained by the task. Diplomacy is a profession by itself which deserves the same preparation a assiduity of attention that men give to other recognized profession---- The diplomatic genius is born, not made. But there are many qualities which may be developed with practice and the greatest part of the necessary knowledge can only be acquired by constant application of the subject. In this sense, diplomacy is certainly a profession itself capable of occupying a man’s whole career, and those who think to embark upon a diplomatic mission as a pleasant diversion from their common task only prepare disappointment for themselves and disaster for the which they serve.

These words represented a personal view but an acknowledgment of the requirements of the modern age diplomacy. Therefore in the conduct of diplomacy for the new world, States have to modernize their governmental structure, mobilize their economic and their resources in rational manner, build up effective and disciplined military establishment, and elaborate a professional civil service that administers State business in accordance with the principles of *raison d’eta*. An indispensable part of the diplomatic corps, which has the important task of formulating the foreign policy that protect and advance a State’s vital interests and of seeing it that it is carried out.⁹

3. Diplomatic Law and Practice of Diplomacy

Diplomatic Law

The codified source of diplomatic law can be found in Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relation¹⁰ and the Vienna Convention on Consular Relation.¹¹ The Conventions was the outcome of a United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities¹² and was based on series of Draft Articles prepared by the International Law Commission (ILC). Diplomatic law in almost all the States borrows from the English Common law before their independence. For instance, the Diplomatic Immunities and Privileges (Commonwealth Countries and Republic of

⁵ Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relation 1961, Article 3 paragraph (d)

⁶H Wootton, *Diplomacy and Early Culture: The Ambassador’s Household*, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304640141-The_Ambassador’s_household, (Accessed January 2011)

⁷A Wicquefort, *The Ambassador and his Functions*, London, B. Lintott, 1716

⁸F Calleres, *On the Manner of Negotiating with Princes*, London, 1716

⁹AC Gordion& LG Alexander, 15-16

¹⁰ Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relation 1961

¹¹ Vienna Convention on Consular Relation 1963

¹² United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities 1961

ONYEAKU: Diplomatic Law And Practice Of Diplomacy In A New Global Environment: Challenges And Opportunities

Ireland) Act¹³ represented Nigeria's diplomatic charter at independence in 1960. This was the position in most Commonwealth countries which later acceded to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relation.¹⁴

In examining diplomatic law, concepts such as immunities and privileges of diplomats are unavoidable. Their protection and inviolability also are important in treating the subject of diplomatic law. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) confirmed the fundamental nature of the law on diplomatic immunities when it stated... 'the maintenance of which is vital for the security and well-being of the complex international community of the present day'.¹⁵ The basis for diplomatic immunities is to enable efficient performance of diplomatic functions and because diplomats are representative of States.¹⁶ To this end, the diplomat is given certain privileges and immunities, and the receiving State is placed under certain obligations. These immunities also extends to situations on which diplomat is not fulfilling his official duties as where he enjoys immunity in private or personal matters. This is also to ensure that diplomats are not subjected to any form of pressure by the receiving states.¹⁷ Therefore the immunity granted to diplomatic agents are those needed for performance of their duty to be independent of the jurisdiction, control command of the receiving State. This was categorically stated in the Preamble to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relation: 'The purposes of such privileges and immunities are not to benefit individual but to ensure the efficient performance of the function of diplomatic mission in representing state'.¹⁸

According to Satow, a privilege denotes some substantive exemption from laws and regulations such as those relating to taxation or social security. A number of diplomatic privileges and immunities which are inviolable do not denote a substantive exemption from local law, rather they impose obligation on the receiving State to treat diplomatic personnel in a particular manner. Such privileges and immunities include immunity from criminal, civil and administrative jurisdiction of the receiving state, immunity from taxes, local charges, traffic rules and customs among others. For this purpose, the person the person of diplomatic agent is inviolable and he is not liable to any form arrest or detention. The receiving State must treat him with due respect and take all necessary and appropriate steps to prevent any attack on his person, his family members, or freedom, or dignity. Customarily, this requires the receiving State not only to the necessary police measure to prevent offences but also to punish offender. It is obvious that terrorists often attack embassy and diplomats, however, State must take all necessary measures to protect diplomats in such circumstances.

Diplomatic immunities and privileges extend to inviolability of residence and property of diplomatic agents. The premises of diplomatic mission are inviolable that agents of the receiving state may not enter them without the consent of the head of the mission. The premises include any building and ancillary land irrespective of ownership, which are used for the purpose of the mission, including the residence of the head of the mission. In the same vein, the property and means of transport of the mission are also immune from search and seizure, and it is the duty of the receiving State to protect the mission. A diplomatic agent is not under any obligation to appear as a witness in court in respect of any civil or criminal or administrative matter. He is also not obliged to give evidence before the court or commissioner sent to his house. Diplomatic immunities and privileges have limitations. Since immunities belongs to the State, it may be waived by the State, or diplomat's superior regardless of his own wishes. Such waiver exposes to prosecution or litigation. If the diplomatic agent commits crime or violates the laws of the receiving State, he is deemed to have waived his immunity and subject to arrest, detention and prosecution. Thus in 1985, Zambia waived the immunity of a diplomat that smuggled cocaine into Britain in a diplomatic bag. Nigeria waived diplomatic in 1984 when her diplomats facilitated the drugging of Umaru Dikko and putting him in a crate for forceful deportation to Nigeria. In *African Renaissance Corporation v Fanlaye* it was held that a waiver by a sovereign must be expressly and positively done by that sovereign. In any case, a State may decide to terminate diplomatic relation with another State. In that case, the State closes its embassy in the receiving State and recalls its ambassadors and other diplomatic agents.

¹³ Diplomatic Immunities and Privileges (Commonwealth Countries and Republic of Ireland) Act 1952

¹⁴ Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relation 1961

¹⁵ *United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran Case* (1980) 1 ICJ Rep.

¹⁶ JC Barker, *The Abuse of Diplomatic Privileges and Immunities: Necessary Evil*, New York, (Dartmouth, 1996), 67

¹⁷ Dixon Martin, *Textbook on International Law*, London, (Blackstone, 1993)

¹⁸ Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relation 1961 (Preamble)

Diplomatic Practice

The interaction among sovereign States inevitably produces dialogues of diplomacy. That is, States talking to States about the business of States. This is the 'infrastructure of world politics'.¹⁹ The practice of diplomacy also entails private negotiations and secret instructions.²⁰ In all these, it is often said that practice of diplomacy center on a State policy of action, undertaken by leaders, diplomats and other government officials as well as by the professional staffs of foreign offices and other bureaus. Public diplomacy is a social practice. It is a form of interaction among social actors that is structured by rules, norms, and habits and that is productive of social resources.²¹ These rules define and constrain the practice of diplomacy, and they are in turn reproduced and challenged in the course of being used. The practice of diplomacy is defined by three elements: it is social, it is State centric, and it produces legal resources for the international system. In its social content, diplomacy connects a public language to the business of the State, giving meaning, reason, and explanations for State action. It is therefore embedded in a social context of reasons, rules, and meanings that exist prior to the interaction. Meaningful diplomacy puts these resources to work in order to explain and justify the action of the State.

The second feature of diplomatic practice is that it is a practice of States and not other kind of actors. That is to say that diplomacy is State centric. This follows naturally from the formal structure of the activity and its connection to the inherently State centric structures of public international law. Only States are obliged under public international law, and only States are therefore qualified to claim credit or to earn demerits for following or breaking international law. Firms and actors cannot engage in public diplomacy as it is defined, because they are not subjects of interstate legal system. However, the injection of non-state actors into public diplomacy has dramatically increased the destiny of interaction. Non-state actors contribute to diplomacy, despite not being subjects of the rules of international law, they can invoke international rules, provide interpretations of behavior and of rules, and construct arguments using the resources of public international law.

As States use international law to explain their behavior, they contribute to remaking and reinforcing those rules. Diplomacy therefore has a productive effect: it produces the public, social, and legal resources with which future State behavior is understood, justified, and argued over. This provides one dynamic for change in international law and international relations, since the content of international law at any point in time is a function of how it has been deployed by actors in the past. The productive element of diplomacy can therefore be seen in cases where international law has developed through practice. Humanitarian intervention, for instance, is increasingly seen as legal under certain circumstances, despite its tension with the ban on war and other rules.

4. Conduct of Diplomatic Relation in a New Global Environment: Challenges and Opportunities

Like the State, traditional diplomacy was accused obsolete, irrelevant and archaic,²² withering away and doing little more than providing dubious solutions to long-forgotten or outdated problems.²³ Diplomats are also under attack. They were stereotypically labelled as blue-blooded public school boys doing nothing much other than following the canapé trail and the pink champagne, ineffectively operating somewhere between the tropical and the alcohol and having a jolly good time abroad living as princes in lavish, ornate residences all at the expense of the taxpayer. Amidst this crisis, non-traditional diplomatic actors began to emerge and proliferate, filling the vacuum of responsibility left by growing numbers of inept failed and failing States. The appearance of new diplomatic actors such as Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), Multinational Corporations (MNCs), Inter-Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and influential celebrities like Bono, Bob Geldof and Bill Gates²⁴ led to the introduction of term like plural, polylateral²⁵ or multi-stakeholder²⁶ to describe the vertical and horizontal networks that came to characterize modern diplomacy. These non-state actors have affected change to the international Relations system,

¹⁹O Jacob, *The Future of Diplomacy: Changing Practices, Evolving Relationships* [2011], *Toronto International Journal of Diplomacy* (vol. 66 No. 3), 527-542

²⁰P Vincent, *Diplomats as Permanent Representatives: The Practical Logics of the Multilateral Pecking Order*, [2011], *International Journal of Diplomacy*, (vol. 66 No. 3), 543-561

²¹I Hurd, 'Law and Practice of Diplomacy' [2011], *International Journal of Law*, 583

²²J Hoffman, 'Reconstructing Diplomacy' [2013], *British Journal of Politics and International Relation* (vol.5, No.4), 525-542

²³S Paul, 'Who Needs Diplomats? The Problem of Diplomatic Representation' [1997], *International Journal* (vol.52 No.4), 619

²⁴A Cooper, *Celebrating Diplomacy*, (Paradigm Publishers, 2007)

²⁵G Wiseman, *Polylateralism and New Modes of Global Dialogue*, Discussion Papers No.59, Leicester, (Leicester Diplomatic Programme, 1999)

²⁶B Hocking, 'Multi-stakeholder Diplomacy: Forms, Functions and Frustrations': *Multi-stakeholder Diplomacy, Challenges and Opportunities*, Malta, (Diplo Foundation, 2006)

ONYEAKU: Diplomatic Law And Practice Of Diplomacy In A New Global Environment: Challenges And Opportunities

thus bringing into renewed and further question the relevance and effectiveness of the State and its diplomacy to solve the growing pains of globalization. In this rapidly growing environment diplomacy came to be interpreted in binary terms, it either was or was not relevant, dead or alive; wither it was in state of decline or it showed evidence of reform and change. Currently, there are 193 States operating in the modern diplomatic environment compared to 47 in 1950 and 26 in 1926. All of these States interact diplomatically, all need to represent themselves, and all need continuously to negotiate advantageous foreign policy ends in an increasingly competitive and hostile environment. With over three hundred years of conduct of relations on a State-to-State basis, through formally accredited resident missions forms the bulk of international exchanges. In other words, claims of irrelevance and obsolescence of diplomacy, or any talk of the death of diplomacy is an old wine in new bottles. No doubt, in the global century more, not less, diplomacy and diplomats that are fit into the new global age are required. This why recently, Hillary Rodham Clinton accurately conveyed the attitude of many diplomatic actors when he said:

To meet these 21st century challenges, we need to use the tools, the new 21st century statecraft; complementing traditional foreign policy tools with newly innovated and adapted instruments of statecraft that fully leverage the networks, technologies, and demographics of our inter connect world...we find ourselves living at a moment in human history when we have the potential to engage in these new and innovative form of diplomacy and to also use them to help individuals be empowered for their own development.²⁷

Challenges and Opportunities

Diplomatic security's mission and the resources needed to carry it out have grown since 1998. Following recent embassy bombings in Africa and other regions of the world, it is argued that diplomatic facilities can no longer meet its security standards and are now vulnerable to terrorist attack. First, this development has led to increase in diplomatic security funding and personnel thereby putting financial stress to embassies and their functions. New global security challenges have also led States and diplomatic missions to face policy and operational challenges. Many States are maintaining missions in increasingly dangerous locations, necessitating the use of more logistics and making it more difficult to provide security in these locations. Second, although States have begun to adopt modern technology for the protection of embassies, functions and activities of embassies has grown considerably, staff and staffing challenges, as well as operational challenges further tax Diplomatic security's ability to implement its mission. Finally, many States has expanded Diplomatic mission without the benefit of adequate strategic planning. This put serious stress on the smooth functioning of the missions. Inadequate buildings and upgrading the existing ones with new facilities pose a challenge to some diplomatic missions thereby exposing them to attack.

Foreign language deficiencies are another serious challenge to diplomatic practice in the new era. Some security officers do not speak and read foreign languages at the level required by their positions. These language shortfalls could be negatively affecting several aspects of diplomatic operations, including security operations. Sometimes host country laws prohibit diplomatic security from taking all the security precautions it would like outside an embassy. For instance, Diplomatic security officials may prefer to arm their local guard forces and their special agents; however, several countries prohibit this. In case of attack, this prohibition limits diplomatic security's ability to protect an embassy or consulate. To confront these challenges successfully, States should conduct strategic review of the Bureau of Diplomatic security to ensure that its mission and activities address State's priority needs. This review should also address key human capital and operational challenges faced by diplomats and diplomatic missions. The creation of a Strategic Planning Unit in the embassy office is necessary. This will enhance performance management in response to the rapidly changing security environment. Finally, diplomatic missions need to take action in order to strategically assess the competing demands on diplomatic security and the resulting mission implications.²⁸

5. Conclusion

Modern diplomatic practice is codified to a considerable larger degree than was the case in Enerst Satow's day. Intriguingly, as Satow makes clear, the 1899 and 1907 Peace conferences at The Hague remain important to international mediation and arbitration. In so far as diplomatic agents are concerned, the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relation 1961, placed on a firmer basis the customary law on diplomacy, clarified and refined the

²⁷H Clinton, *21st Century Statecraft*, United States Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/statecraft/index/htm>. (Accessed October 16 2012)

²⁸JC Michael, *Diplomatic Security Challenges*, United States Congress House Committee on Foreign Affairs, (Accountability Office, 2012)

privileges and immunities of diplomats. However, the traditional diplomatic institutions are reforming and adapting to their dynamic environment. In the light of public and private calls for reform and changes in society such as the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) revolution diplomacy, the practice of diplomacy in the globalized world requires dynamic policy and dynamic diplomats. The diplomatic renaissance to contain the pitfall of globalization must allude to a more general preference for business of peace over the industry of war. Globalization, the increased speed of access to information, now no longer privileged, have weakened the monopoly role of States in Diplomacy; and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) increasingly fill inches in international politics that have opened up in consequence. This has led to parallel growth in 'track two diplomacy', which may be pursued on its own or in conjunction with, and often complementing official diplomatic efforts. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and their activities are less well regulated than official diplomacy. Nevertheless, Satow urges professional diplomats to accept with good grace the loss of their monopoly as actors in the field of international relation. Rather than indulge in turf war, they should cultivate closer ties with NGOs representatives, barter information, and exploit the advantages that cooperation with them has to offer. As modern diplomatic practice has undergone considerable change, State policies and actors must key into changes to meet challenges of global diplomacy of the 21st century.