

## **International Relations: Interrogating Global Dynamics of Diplomacy in The Post-World War 1 Era**

**Udeagwu, C. Okechukwu**

Department of History and International Studies,  
Faculty of Arts, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State  
Email: co.udeagwu@unizik.edu.ng

&

**Ikenna E. Nnubia**

Department of History and International Studies,  
Faculty of Arts, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State  
Email: ikennannubia@yahoo.com

### **Abstract**

Modern diplomatic activities have been changing and deepening in international relations. Some aspects of traditional diplomacy have been modernized to reflect the present conduct of international affairs; although, global diplomacy in post-World War 1 has experienced dramatic attention arising from the Wilsonian open covenant of the Fourteen Points Agenda which brought about open diplomacy. This paper examines international relations: interrogating global dynamics of diplomacy in the post-World War 1 era. Secondary and tertiary data analyzed in qualitative historical methods are utilized in this study. The paper argues that the shift from old diplomacy which thrived on secret negotiations and alliances to new diplomacy characterized by openness anchored on the League of Nations failed to maintain peace and security in post-World War 1. The study finds that irrespective of the heralded new diplomacy, secret diplomacy still triumphed among the practitioners in post-World War 1 international relations. The paper concludes that the global dynamics of diplomacy in the post-World War 1 era depicted both new and old diplomacy but the hope of new diplomacy of openness could not forestall the very threat of the secret and manipulative old diplomacy which demonstrated to the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939-1945.

**Keywords:** International Relations, Global Dynamics, Old Diplomacy, New Diplomacy, and Post-World War 1

### **Introduction**

International relations is saddled with the interaction of states and other numerous actors with divergent aspects of cooperation that make the international system meaningful and systemic. Diplomacy is one of the concepts that illuminates the activities of these actors both in their bilateral and multilateral relations and pursuit of interest in the international system. The conduct and management of international affairs outside diplomacy can be seen as mere contemplations. Within the realm of international relations, diplomatic negotiation is central to the functioning of the system of nation-states and sub-state actors that have evolved.

Diplomacy involves negotiation and bargaining in international system. Through negotiation and bargaining, states try to resolve or avoid conflicts of interest from the bulk of state-to-state relations and enter into mutually beneficial arrangements. In likewise manner, non-state actors are increasingly part of international diplomacy as well, a situation that characterizes actors that are not neither sovereign states nor reliant on the state for membership and direction. These actors negotiate and bargain among themselves in their respective interests. But, at times, negotiate directly with other states in the international system.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, negotiation and bargaining among other things are veritable mechanisms in the continuous process by which global dynamics of diplomacy in post-World War 1 can be appreciated.

The global dynamics of diplomacy in post-World War 1 signifies the influx of multi-dimensional and complex diplomatic intercourse that cut across national boundaries on areas of political, economic, social, cultural, and other aspects of formal and informal institutional interactions. These aspects include education, technology, environment, gender, peace and security, etc. Thus, in this study, the ongoing introduction, discourse in the historical evolution of diplomacy, definitional and conceptual analysis of diplomacy, contextualizing pluses to global dynamics of diplomacy in the post-World War 1, global dynamics diplomacy in post-World War 1: successes and misgivings, and conclusion shall be considered step by step.

### **Discourse in Historical Evolution of Diplomacy**

The historicity of diplomatic tradition, which eventually became modern diplomacy, evolved out of the Greek, Roman, Italian, and French systems. The historical evolution of organized diplomacy originated from Greek city-states, owing to their interactions with one another where the various Greek city-states happened to deal with each other more or less as equals and developed significant codes of conduct and practices that formed the basis of the beginning but fledgling diplomatic system.<sup>2</sup> Anthony and Ositadinma observe that by the 5<sup>th</sup> century B. C. special

missions between Greek city-states had become prevalent with regular diplomatic interactions achieved.<sup>3</sup> The role and position of 'proxenos', a prominent citizen of a 'polis' who represented the interest of another polis within his own polis remained remarkable in the evolution of diplomacy in Greek city-states.<sup>4</sup>

However, Martin Nguru explains that diplomacy has existed since time immemorial, is said to be as old as humankind, and predates recorded history. In terms of diplomacy being as old as recorded history, he argues that the first records of diplomatic activities in history were in southern Iraq around 2,500 B. C.<sup>5</sup> The evolution of diplomacy, by its very mythological theory, and in the sense of ordered conduct of relations between one group of human beings and another group strange to themselves were attributed to angels of God, as it was argued that the first diplomats were 'angels' from God who served as 'angeloi or messengers' between heaven and earth.<sup>6</sup>

The historical evolution of diplomacy was hamstrung by the Romans, probably, because of the nature of the great empires that did not deal with other groups as equals let alone to be negotiated with. Nevertheless, before to the emergence of the Roman Empire, the Roman senate, during the Republican period grew famous and assumed the right to prepare and dispatch diplomatic missions as well as receive incoming ones, however, contributed little to the field of diplomacy but advanced international law.<sup>7</sup>

Modern diplomacy as a formal profession can be traced to the states of Northern Italy in the early Renaissance, with the first embassies being established in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. Milan played a leading role, especially under Francesco Sforza (Duke of Milan) who established the very first permanent mission at Genoa in 1455, and to the other cities and states of Northern Italy.<sup>8</sup> Thus, from the 13<sup>th</sup> century onward, Venice distinguished herself in international politics and codified several rules of diplomacy in such a way that by the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the Italian city-states started to establish permanent diplomatic missions across Europe.

The practice spread from Italy to the other European powers. In 1496, Venice established a resident mission in London and appointed two merchants. Thereafter, permanent residence embassies of Italian city-states were built in London, Paris, and at the court of the papacy (Holy Roman Emperor) and Charles V. British ambassadors (Sir Thomas Boleyn and Dr. West) by 1519, were assigned to residence in Paris. Also, Francis I of France organized something such as permanent diplomatic machinery.<sup>9</sup> It was in Italy that many of the traditions of modern diplomacy began, such as the presentation of an ambassador's credentials to the head of state.

By the late 16<sup>th</sup> century and the dawn of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, permanent missions became the standard, and all the major European powers were exchanging representatives. Diplomacy had become an established profession and a generally accepted method of international relations. The Westphalian Treaty of 1648 which could be adjudged as the first general congress of the major powers of Europe legitimized the independent sovereign state system, and thereby crystallized and formalized the modern international system contributed to the evolution of diplomacy.<sup>10</sup> Anthony and Ositadinma posit that:

*The height of diplomatic intercourse between the emergent states became highly appreciated as diplomats from all European countries, other countries from all parts of France and including noblemen graced the Court of Louis XIV and gave it elegant celebration it deserved amongst his contemporaries which laid precedent for decades to come diplomatic practices. Diplomats, therefore, represented their sovereigns, and most times, happened to be the willing instrument in the great competitions for empire and for supremacy in Europe that were waged during the time. Powerful rulers like Peter the Great of Russia, and Fredrick the Great of Prussia utilized diplomacy to achieve their end as the situation required.<sup>11</sup>*

In the seventeenth to the eighteenth century, the historical evolution of diplomacy was demonstrated in France. The French adopted the Italian diplomatic tradition. Nevertheless, elaborate ceremonies, clandestine negotiations, and the gradual professionalization of diplomacy epitomized the French version of the diplomatic system. The French introduced confidentiality in relation to information gathering, restructuring of protocols, and diplomatic corps.<sup>12</sup>

The diplomatic landscape of the 18<sup>th</sup> century through the innovation of the permanent residence mission, aftermath, and the treaty of Utrecht in 1714 witnessed persistent diplomatic dialogue on the bilateral front but intermittent one on the multilateral or collective end in the historical evolution of diplomacy. Diplomats were meant based on aristocratic class and background, and the service they rendered was made professional. With this,

diplomats everywhere recognized each other as colleagues. The *spirit of esprit de corps* enhances their professionalism; thus, they were known in different European Courts as the *corps diplomatique*.<sup>13</sup>

The entire system was greatly disrupted by the Napoleonic French Revolution of 1799- 1815, and the subsequent years of warfare. The revolution saw commoners take over the diplomacy of the French state; and those conquered by revolutionary armies. Ranks of precedence were abolished. Napoleon also refused to acknowledge diplomatic immunity, imprisoning several British diplomats accused of scheming against France.<sup>14</sup> The historical evolution of diplomacy became less formal and restricted; however, it was reinvigorated by the anti-hegemonic coalition of great powers to wit, Britain, Prussia, Austria, and Russia against Napoleon's imperial ambition which resulted to the Vienna Congress of 1814-1815.<sup>15</sup>

After the fall of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna of 1815 established an international system of diplomatic rank. The Congress, according to Palmer and Perkins, laid down certain grand rules in relationship with the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818 to reposition diplomacy; and established four ranks of representatives which include, "(1) ambassadors, papal legates, and papal nuncios; (2) envoys extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary; (3) minister resident. later merged with the second rank; (4) charges d'affaires".<sup>16</sup>

The 19th and 20th centuries as a result of major global events; the expansion of colonialism and the two World Wars impacted to the historical evolution of diplomacy. The competition between European powers for territories in Africa known as the Scramble for Africa was one of the major events that characterized the colonial expansion in the 19th century. This expansion led to increased tensions and competition between colonial powers, resulting in conflicts and wars. Diplomacy during this period was often focused on maintaining and securing colonies, rather than promoting peace and cooperation.<sup>17</sup>

The outbreak of World War I in 1914 marked a turning point in the history of diplomacy as it led to the collapse of several empires and the creation of new nation-states. During the war, diplomacy was focused on negotiating peace treaties and securing alliances. The Treaty of Versailles with its attendant 'Fourteen Points Agenda' which was signed, marked the end of the war and established a new international order under the League of Nations further influenced the historical evolution of diplomacy.<sup>18</sup>

However, the outbreak of World War II in 1939 significantly impacted on the historical evolution of diplomacy as it led to the emergence of the United States (US) and the Soviet Union as superpowers, and establishment of the United Nations (UN). Diplomacy during the war focused on forming alliances and negotiating peace. Consequently, the formation of the UN in 1945 marked a shift towards multilateral diplomacy. The UN was established as a forum for nations to resolve and discuss issues through collective action as well as negotiation. It has played a significant role in maintaining peace and stability in international relations within the purview of multilateral diplomacy.<sup>19</sup> It is therefore through the historical evolution of diplomacy that the practice of modern diplomacy developed.

### **Definitional and Conceptual Analysis of Diplomacy**

The definitional and conceptual meaning of the term 'diplomacy' is broad and different, more especially, among scholars in the social sciences or humanities. Thus, the pursuit of a single, all-encompassing definition of diplomacy is futile given the nature of international relations. The word diplomacy came from the Greek verb 'diploun' which means 'to fold'. While, the word 'diploma' was used by the Romans, a derivation of the Greek word 'diploun' happened to be coined as a name for official documents such as passports and passes. By the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, the word became associated with the preservation of archives, the analysis of past treaties, and the study of the history of international negotiations.<sup>20</sup> Diplomacy is the art and science of maintaining peaceful relationships between nations, groups, or individuals - diplomacy refers to representatives of different groups discussing such issues as conflict, trade, the environment, technology, or security.<sup>21</sup> Tethloach Ruey gives divergent definitions of diplomacy and defines diplomacy:

*as a 'communication between strangers'; a 'dialogue between states'; diplomacy is a 'communication that facilitates international society, the diplomatic profession being the custodian of the idea of international society'; 'diplomacy is the conduct of international relations by negotiation rather than by force, propaganda, or recourse to law, and by other peaceful means; diplomacy is the 'management of relations (political, security, military, economic, scientific, cultural, etc.) between states and between states and other international actors, such as global/regional organizations, INGOs, transnational corporations, etc.,*

*by negotiation'; diplomacy as the 'management of international relations by communications to include negotiations, leading to a bargain or agreement.'*<sup>22</sup>

The above definition of diplomacy seems to touch on all aspects to which diplomacy supposedly applied, but the consideration of diplomacy as a communication between strangers makes diplomatic activity and profession look absurd because bargaining and negotiation as the art of diplomacy cannot exist in isolation; familiar and identifiable relationship whether positive or negative should be in place.

L.O. Oladejo Oyelakin notes that diplomacy in Satow's *Guide to Diplomatic Practice*, published in 1917, is defined as the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of independent states, sometimes extending also to their relations with vassal states; or, more briefly still, the conduct of business between states by peaceful means.<sup>23</sup> Palmer and Perkins see diplomacy as "the management of international relations by negotiation, or the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed". They further argue that diplomacy proper is a process by which policy is carried out; meaning that diplomacy aims to provide the machinery and personnel by which foreign policy is executed.<sup>24</sup> The ongoing definition of diplomacy in this paper so far, conceptually considered, exposes diplomacy to have its operational meaning and sense when it involves relations of actors across national boundaries. In other words, the question is, can diplomacy be said to be diplomacy when its activities and operations exist within the domestic arena or organization of actors involved?

Harold Nicolson in his work titled, *Diplomacy*, published in 1939, as quoted by Ehimika A. Ifidon, defines diplomacy as the art of negotiating agreements between sovereign states. Ifidon goes further to demonstrate Hedley Bull's definition of diplomacy in his book named, *The Anarchical Society*, published in 1977, where diplomacy is defined as the conduct of relations between states and other entities with standing in world politics by official agents and by peaceful means.<sup>25</sup> The definitional meaning of diplomacy conjures the idea that diplomacy starts but by the consequences of the bad relationship between states and other actors in international relations. This looks real when diplomacy is often associated with the words like, "between, negotiating agreement, management or conduct of relations, etc. However, diplomacy can thrive when there is also a good relationship, but it has been argued that the word "diplomacy" itself has English Language indiscriminate and differential confusions both in meaning and concept. These include the following according to Orugbani that:

*Firstly, diplomacy is employed as a synonym for foreign policy, like say, British diplomacy in the Middle East ...; secondly, it is taken to mean a branch of the foreign service, like say, my father is working for diplomacy; thirdly, meaning of diplomacy as abstract quality or gift which implies the more guileful aspects of tact; fourthly, meaning of diplomacy as signifies negotiation, like say, the Bakasi problem can be resolved by diplomacy; fifthly, interpretation is one way the word diplomacy denotes the process and machinery by which negotiation is carried out.*<sup>26</sup>

The conceptual definition of diplomacy, at its core, is a basic human activity, the desire to resolve problems amicably, and provides a channel for peaceful resolution of disputes. If diplomacy is seen as the systematic conduct or management of international relations, it connotes that it composed of the political, economic, and social undertones that determine and shape interactions among states. With this, diplomacy suggests that a diplomat employs wisdom in the projection of the composition of interests and objectives of a country such as political, economic, and social in relationships with others. The need to consider the interest of others which often may conflict with one's interest and its management captures the concept of diplomacy.<sup>27</sup>

By extension, it entails those principles of negotiation, which are common to all international relations. Diplomacy is the principal substitute for using force or underhanded means in statecraft; it is how comprehensive national power is applied to the peaceful adjustment of differences between states. It may be coercive (i.e., backed by the threat to apply punitive measures or to use force) but is overtly nonviolent. Its primary instruments are international dialogue and negotiation, primarily conducted by accredited envoys (a term derived from the French *envoyé*, meaning "one who is sent") and other political leaders. Diplomacy is conducted in confidence but, its results are almost always made public in contemporary international relations.<sup>28</sup>

The objective of diplomacy is to strengthen the state, nation, or organization it serves in relation to others by advancing the interests in its custody. To this end, diplomatic activity endeavours to maximize a group's advantages without the risk and expense of using force and preferably without causing resentment. It habitually, but not invariably, strives to preserve peace; diplomacy is strongly inclined toward negotiation to achieve agreements and resolve issues between states. Even in times of peace, diplomacy may involve coercive threats of

economic or other punitive measures or demonstrations of the capability to impose unilateral solutions to disputes by the application of military power. However, diplomacy normally seeks to develop goodwill toward the state it represents, nurturing relations with foreign states and peoples.<sup>29</sup>

The definitional and conceptual meaning of diplomacy suggests that a pivotal goal of diplomacy is to facilitate peaceful relationships between nations during a crisis. Diplomacy is, therefore, partly about peacekeeping, but it is also about peacemaking. It is noted that when international conflicts loom on the horizon, a primary function of diplomacy is anticipatory and pre-emptive, while it aims to prevent the escalation of conflicts and avoid the use of force such as: “minimize the friction between states,” “overcome disagreements,” “reconcile differences,” “avoid conflicts,” “prevent military action,” or “prevent having to resort to force”.<sup>30</sup>

Therefore, if diplomacy is inclined to negotiate an agreement by peaceful means, what happens when diplomacy fails? War may likely occur, and this comes to mean conceptually that diplomacy is useful during war. It conducts the passages from protest to menace, dialogue to negotiation, ultimatum to reprisal, and war to peace and reconciliation with other states. Diplomacy builds and tends the coalitions that deter or make war. It disrupts the alliances of enemies and sustains the passivity of potentially hostile powers. It contrives the termination of war, and forms, strengthens, and sustains the peace that follows conflict in international relations.

### **Contextualizing Pluses to Global Dynamics of Diplomacy in Post-World War 1**

Post-World War 1 witnessed the internationalization of diplomacy. Before World War 1, Europe was the epicenter of the world and European diplomatic activities virtually had consequences for the rest of the world. European states' international relations were regulated by such concepts as balance of power, concert diplomacy, and treaty alliances. The advent of the 1914-1918 Great War influenced the European international system and at the same time unleashed new forces that invariably dislocated the old order. The deliberation and Peace Settlement of Versailles which ended the war brought the most innovative outcome of inter-state relations for the establishment of the League of Nations. The League of Nations charted a new course in the conduct of international affairs, whittled down the ‘old diplomacy’ which thrived on secret negotiations and alliances, and introduced a ‘new diplomacy’ featured with an openness which its operational apparatus centered on the covenant of the League of Nations as the basis of achieving collective security in the international relations.<sup>31</sup>

A remarkable development indubitably took place after the First World War when diplomacy became an open affair practice and attracted the involvement of different persons elected by the people and accountable to the people of their countries, settled great issues in big gatherings or conferences, and their proceedings or outcomes were overtly known to all. President Woodrow Wilson of the United States of America whose Fourteen Points opened with the principle of open covenants of peace as credited as the father of new diplomacy.<sup>32</sup>

The global dynamics of diplomacy in the post-World War 1 era were predicated by the increasing manifestation, domination, and participation of people and government in new dimensions of diplomacy characterized by different appellations ranging from open diplomacy, democratic or popular/open diplomacy, personal/ summit and near-summit diplomacy, parliamentary diplomacy, public diplomacy and conference/multilateral diplomacy, totalitarian diplomacy, etc. Recognizing the diplomatic revolution witnessed by the above types of conduct of diplomacy. Palmer and Perkins explain that the normal channels of diplomacy are the foreign offices and the diplomatic and consular establishments, but, often bypassed by one reason or another ..., states have had increasing resort to “diplomacy by conference”. In the postwar period international conferences have proliferated as never before, although, this is by no means a new technique as there were international conferences of sort in the ancient world, however, it became really popular after the First World War under the stimulus of the League of Nations and quest for regional and collective security, ... it has become so common as to constitute a new development in international relations.<sup>33</sup>

The post-World War 1 diplomacy provided regular occasions where the representatives of all member states could meet and discuss not only common problems but any matter that seemed liable to endanger world peace. By making available standing machinery for such gatherings and permanent means of joint discussion, the league was an improved and wider version of the series of congresses that the great powers of Europe had held from time to time throughout the century before 1914. The diplomacy after the League of Nations was something new and different compare with the old diplomacy; it was global in nature and scope against the Old Diplomacy which was Eurocentric. The rise of the United States of America, Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the emergence of a large number of independent sovereign states, coupled with non-state actors in categories of transnational corporations (TNCs) or multinational corporations (MNCs), nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), international governmental organizations (IGOs) and other transnational organizations influenced the character of

post-world war diplomatic relations. Thus, post-World War diplomacy through the League of Nations was the first universal organization to be established in the world and was a vital force in international politics.<sup>34</sup>

The global dynamics of diplomacy in post-World War 1 orchestrated multilateral international cooperation both at supranational and regional levels, transforming diplomacy into a much more open and less secret in practice. Multilateral negotiations in international conferences with institutionalized diplomacy triumphed the emergence of direct personal contacts among the statesmen and leaders of various states, therefore, combined to give a new look and content to diplomacy. Furthermore, the machinery of foreign affairs previously exclusive to ambassadors now extended to different ministries of the state such as the ones of trade and defence.<sup>35</sup>

Post-World War 1 Diplomacy experienced a major transformation in the modes and techniques associated with it in the field of international relations. Summits, shuttle diplomacy and track-two diplomacy became popular methods of negotiation in the new diplomacy. The speed of international travel and globalization combined with the growing amount of issues on the world stage such as piracy, wartime embargoes, the rights of diplomats, and the status of combatants and neutrals during times of war, human rights, disarmament, international crime, refugees, migration, problems of nationality, and the treatment of prisoners, the use of force, and the conduct of war, etc., unavoidably, gave rise for the proliferation of easier and more practical types of diplomacy.<sup>36</sup>

Contextualizing the trends of the post-World War 1 diplomacy, Palmer and Pekins in support of Efevottu's position further acknowledge that the new dimensions in the diplomacy were characterized by new techniques, new practices, and new types of diplomats, however, they argued that three developments which indicated the broadening scope of democratic diplomacy and the emergence of totalitarian democracy were particularly striking: the increasing incidence of public multilateral negotiations; the expansion of diplomatic activity into the cultural and educational field; and the multiplication of informal channels of contact among peoples and nations gave this era a distinctive hue.<sup>37</sup> These informal channels or penetrations and their rapid growth reverberated the global dynamics of post-World War 1 diplomacy between and among states on a large scale, and thus added an important level to international politics involved:

*Informal governmental access, achieved by agents of a governmental organization; quasi-governmental access, including the activities of some journalist, scholars, or representative of companies such as United Fruit or Aramco, whose operation occasionally have an almost governmental character; nongovernmental access, including the activities of missionaries, tourist, students, teachers, researchers, engineers, businessmen and the like; informal access by an international organization to the people or processes of a nation by virtue of its operations there; informal access by a nation through the medium of an international organization.*<sup>38</sup>

Therefore, phenomenon of informal penetration or access has aspects and implications far beyond the scope of diplomacy, but, it clearly demonstrates the types of diplomatic relations and practices which were almost unknown in the days of diplomacy prior to world war 1.

Post-World War 1 diplomacy provided an operational environment both within a country and internationally where knowledge management of diplomatic processes were practicable. Most of these processes were related to consular activities such as issuing of visas or passports, filling out forms, and recommendations, checking criminal records, etc. International regimes in the fields of environment, trade, human rights, etc. based on international conventions consist of machinery that organizes regular meetings, processes documents, provides opinions, and controls the implementation of conventions. Bilateral and multilateral relations between actors in international relations increasingly followed certain patterns of cooperation. For example, regular meetings of mixed committees on highly technical areas (environment and trade) like double taxation, air-service transport, and investment were established according to clear patterns. Diplomatic activities, consisting mainly of negotiation both on multilateral and bilateral levels aimed at solving international crises or problems with knowledge management and diplomacy became obvious.<sup>39</sup>

### **Global Dynamics of Diplomacy in Post-World War 1: Mixed Reaction of Success and Misgiving**

Post-World War 1 global dynamics of diplomacy provided the framework by which the new diplomacy successfully featured remarkably with the various types of diplomacy to achieve peace and collective security in international relations, especially, under conference or multilateral diplomacy of the League of Nations. Ultimately, there was the famous Locarno Treaty of 1925, the most important treaty of the post-World War 1 era which was proposed by the British Foreign Secretary, Austen Chamberlain meant to further relax tension in

Europe. This treaty was a multilateral agreement by Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, and Germany to guarantee the frontiers of France and Belgium. Treaties of defense against aggression by Germany were also signed with France and both Poland and Czechoslovakia. On the other hand, Germany agreed to submit for arbitration any dispute between her and other powers including Poland and Belgium. The treaty made war far less occurrence in the future, aggression was denounced by Germany in her relations with other European powers and there was relative peace in Europe. Germany was admitted as a member of the League of Nations with a permanent place on the Council.<sup>40</sup>

Post-World War 1 diplomacy under the League of Nations was strengthened by the Locarno Pact and better relations between Germany and its neighbours in forestalling the war which broke out in 1926 between Greece and Bulgaria. In this war, the Greeks invaded Bulgaria by the reason that some Greek soldiers were killed on the Bulgaria-Greek boundaries. But Bulgaria appealed to the League of Nations which after much consideration ordered for Greeks withdrawal from Bulgaria and payment of compensation for the damages caused by their attack. The Greeks capitulated to the strong and confrontational demands of the League. Furthermore, conference diplomacy underwent the litmus test within the League of Nations in the settlement of the dispute between Turkey and the new Arab state of Iraq over the possession of Mosul, an oil-rich axis on the boundaries between Turkey and Iraq. The decision of the League which gave the area to Iraq was finally accepted by the Turks. The relevance of the League of Nations in maintaining peace and security, however, was seen in the administration of the free port of Danzig and the Saar territory as captured in the Versailles Treaty, and the arrangement of important loans to support Austria, Hungary, Greece and Bulgaria.<sup>41</sup>

Another post-World War I significant international diplomacy and agreement in favour of peace that prohibited all wars of aggression in European international relations was the famous Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, jointly advocated by the American Secretary of State Kellogg and French Foreign Minister Briand. This pact which was signed by all the Great Powers including Russia and a host of other nations principally, renounced war as an instrument of state policy save for self-defense.<sup>42</sup> Thus, between the period 1925 and 1929 European society an outburst of optimism and relaxation of tension.

However, the traits of global dynamics of diplomacy in the post-World War 1 era were viewed with misgivings, owing to the arguments against some types of new diplomacy introduced by the period under study. J. C. Johari observes, it is hazardous to make all negotiations public, the work of diplomats is such a delicate nature that much harm can occur by discarding the course of secrecy in each case... in consideration of democratic diplomacy, he argues that this kind of diplomacy invites 'dangers', since the people, in general are ignorant and are not capable of exercising control over the role of professional and skilled diplomats, ... exposure to the public of each diplomatic effort would put the diplomats in a very awkward situation and operation of diplomacy in such a manner would suffer from the evil of delay and imprecision.<sup>43</sup> This, therefore follows that public negotiation is difficult and that early disclosure of bargaining strategy would compromise the ability to win concessions, and concession itself may be difficult to make amid popular criticism.

To summit diplomacy, some scholars of international relations like Palmer and Perkins averred that, unlike professional diplomats, top leaders who have many responsibilities and preoccupations that they do not have time to prepare adequately or participate in tedious international meetings negatively affected diplomacy. Hence, the increasing involvement of heads of state, prime ministers, and foreign ministers characterized most times by incompetence, subjective ill-conceived and unexpected agreement considerations, and misunderstanding of their functions and the important distinctions between foreign policy and diplomacy direct participation to international negotiations was viewed with huge misgivings.<sup>44</sup> Also, it is observed that most world leaders are characterized by a healthy dose of ego, and when such egos collide, negotiations can quickly deteriorate from unmanageable to confrontation. Again, the introduction of public diplomacy by the post-World War 1 international politics with the target of conducting diplomacy under the glare of television lights for everything official to be seen, heard, and read by others, and creating an overall international image that enhances a country's ability to achieve diplomatic success led to distortion through propaganda<sup>45</sup>

Diplomacy in post-World War 1 era under totalitarian diplomacy was equally affected by the advent of totalitarian regimes with strong ideologies; more often than not, these regimes honoured established diplomatic rules only when it suited them, and they generally eschewed negotiation and compromise. They made use of modern techniques of military, political, and psychological power to expand their dominions, to gain control of other states. The government of the Soviet Union, for example, viewed all capitalist states as enemies. Especially under the leadership of Joseph Stalin, it used each concession it won as a basis to press for another, and it viewed diplomacy as war, not as a process of mutual compromise. Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler was equally

indifferent to accommodation and Western opinion once it achieved rearmament; Hitler signed treaties intending keep them only as long as the terms suited him, regarded with contempt those who tried to accommodate him, and cowed foreign leaders with tantrums and threats.<sup>46</sup> The representatives of totalitarian states thus:

*invoked strange doctrines of racial superiority, mysticism, materialism, and militarism to further their ends; they degraded diplomatic language and practice as tool of national policy; diplomats became agents of conquest, double-dealing, and espionage, whose business was not to work for peaceful international relations but to provoke dissension rather than understanding; to make the leaders and people of other nations weak and blind and divided in the face of the growing totalitarian regime menace ...*<sup>47</sup>

The belief by the totalitarian states and their representatives/diplomats that accepted standards of international conduct only makes sense when the schemes of affairs favour them, coupled with their boast that treaties and other international obligations albeit bilateral and multilateral in nature would be violated at will in as much as it tilted their interest was the highest misgivings of the totalitarian diplomacy of the new diplomacy. It was, therefore, the above belief of strong ideologies that encouraged Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler to influence the global dynamics of diplomacy in the post-World War 1 era. The preponderance of Germany demonstrated the highest misgivings of the new diplomacy (open diplomacy, democratic or popular/open diplomacy, personal/summit and near-summit diplomacy, parliamentary diplomacy, public diplomacy and conference/multilateral diplomacy, totalitarian diplomacy, etc.) in international relations.

By the 1930s, global dynamics of diplomacy in the post-World War 1 era became truncated through European diplomatic relations which experienced a series of convulsions following the ascendance of Adolf Hitler to power in 1933. The tearing to pieces of what remains of the Versailles Treaty, building of the military industry of Germany, militarize of the Rhineland, annexation of Austria, occupation of Sudetenland (part of Czechoslovakia) and establishment of Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis by alliance with Italy, a sister fascist state in 1936, and Japan, an ambitious and expansionist state, in 1939 brought a death-knell to League of Nations.<sup>48</sup> The diplomatic failure of the League of Nations to forestall the rising power of Germany and prevent the outbreak of the Second World War undoubtedly displayed the highest levels of misgivings of the new diplomacy.

### **Conclusion**

This paper has shown that global diplomacy in post-World War 1 era was subject to evolutionary change, adapting to the consequences and new challenges that were present in the aftermath of the Great War. Diplomacy is the art of conducting negotiations in a prudent and calculated manner so that the aim is achieved, as far as possible, in a positive or negative approach. It remains the central mechanism for conducting relations among the states of the world and other international non-state actors. President Woodrow Wilson, as a father of new diplomacy emanating from the Versailles Treaty of 1918-1919 in the shaping of the post-World War international affairs and maintenance of peace and collective security introduced a myriad of different diplomacy including open diplomacy, conference/multilateral diplomacy, democratic diplomacy, etc. The Great War must be considered as the root cause for the changes in the diplomatic method, and a catalyst to which governments increasingly committed to international relations.

New diplomacy certainly occurred and changed the old pattern of diplomacy, but, had not allow for public discourse during the negotiation process as first hoped. However, new diplomacy under the aegis of League of Nations multilateral diplomacy achieved some levels of success as observed in the famous Locarno Treaty of 1925 and the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928. However, new diplomacy demonstrated many misgivings in nature, character, and practice that made diplomats, major powers, and totalitarian states continue to pursue policy interests that negatively and eventually influenced the dynamics of global diplomacy in post-World War 1 international relations. Thus, the global dynamics of diplomacy in the Post-World War 1 era brought about new diplomacy with the huge hope of conducting international relations to stop tensions and achieve peace and security. However, the expectations of the new diplomacy failed to impede the very threat of the secret and manipulative old diplomacy which manifested itself in the outbreak of the Second World War between 1939 and 1945.



## Endnotes

1. Juliet Kaarbo and James Lee Ray, *Global Politic 10<sup>th</sup> Edition*, Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2011, P. 294.
2. Leo E. Otoide and Emmanuel Okoh, "Evolution of The International System and The Transition to Modern Diplomatic Practice" in Fred I. A. Omu and Leo E. Otoide (eds.) *Themes in International Studies and Diplomacy*, Benin City: Mindex Publishing, 2002, P. 31.
3. Obi Emeka Anthony and Ozor Cyril Ositadinma, *The Process of International Relations: Theories, Processes and Institutions*, Onitsha: BookPoint Education LTD, 2009, P. 126.
4. Otoide and Okoh, "Evolution of The International System ...", P. 31.
5. Martin Nguru, Diplomacy's Evolution from Horseback to Zoom <https://www.africaportal.org/features/diplomacys-evolution-horseback-zoom/#:~:text=The%20development%20or%20evolution%20of,during%20the%20age%20of%20demo> cracy (Retrieved on 20/06/2023).
6. Adaye Orugbani, *A History of European Diplomacy*, Port Harcourt: Vret Books Publisher, 2006, P. 3.
7. Anthony and Ositadinma, *The Process of International Relations ...*, P. 127.
8. Orugbani, *A History of European Diplomacy ...*, P. 10.
9. Orugbani, *A History of European Diplomacy ...*
10. Otoide and Okoh, "Evolution of The International System ...", P. 41.
11. Anthony and Ositadinma, *The Process of International Relations ...*, P.129.
12. Tethloach Domach Ruey, *The History of Diplomacy and the Ancient Greek, Italian, Roman and French Diplomatic Traditions* <https://www.diplomatic-world-institute.com/en/history/> (Retrieved on 20/06/2023).
13. Otoide and Okoh, "Evolution of The International System ...", P. 44.
14. "A Brief History of Diplomacy" <http://www.ediplomat.com/nd/history.htm> (Retrieved on 20/06/2023).
15. Otoide and Okoh, "Evolution of The International System ...", P. 45.
16. Norman D. Palmer and Howard C. Perkin, *International Relations Third Revised Edition*, India: A. I. T. B. S. Publishers and Distributors, 2005, P. 93.
17. See B. Barkindo, et al, *Africa and the Wider World 3: Africa Since the Scramble*, Ikeja: Longman Nigeria Plc, 1994, PP. 12-14.
18. Herbert L. Peacock, *A History of Modern Europe 1789-1970*, London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1961, PP. 293-294.
19. Zubeda Anjum Niaz, *History of Diplomacy: From Ancient Times to Modern Era* <https://thediplomaticinsight.com/history-of-diplomacy-from-ancient-times-to-modern-era/> (Retrieved on 20/06/2023).
20. Rudy I. Ohikhokhai, "Introduction to Philosophy and Methodology of International Studies and Diplomacy" in Fred I. A. Omu and Leo E. Otoide (eds.) *Themes in International Studies and Diplomacy*, Benin City: Mindex Publishing, 2002, P. 58.
21. National Geographic Society, "Diplomacy" <https://education.nationalgeographic.org/resource/diplomacy/> (Retrieved on 25/06/2023).
22. Tethloach Ruey, Understanding diplomacy. Definition and differences to foreign policy and international relations <https://www.grin.com/document/373969> (Retrieved on 25/06/2023).
23. L.O. Oladejo Oyelakin, *The Nigerian Foreign Service Administration*, Lagos: NIIA, 1989 P. 8.
24. Palmer and Perkin, *International Relations Third Revised Edition*, P. 84.
25. Ehimika A. Ifidon, "Introduction to International Studies and Diplomacy" in Fred I. A. Omu and Leo E. Otoide (eds.) *Themes in International Studies and Diplomacy*, Benin City: Mindex Publishing, 2002, PP. 16-17.
26. Orugbani, *A History of European Diplomacy ...*, P. 2.
27. Hillary I. Ekemam, *International Politics and Contemporary Global Relations*, Owerri: Great Stars Publishers International Company, 2015, P. 197.
28. Chas W. Freeman and Sally Marks, "Diplomacy" <https://www.britannica.com/topic/diplomacy#ref233733> (Retrieved on 27/06/2023).
29. Kaarbo and Lee Ray, *Global Politic 10<sup>th</sup> Edition*, PP. 294-295. Also See Freeman and Marks, "Diplomacy" ...
30. Dan Hart and Asaf Siniver, "The Meaning of Diplomacy" *International Negotiation* 26 (2021), P. 16.
31. Edward Erhagbe and Emmanuel Okoh, "The International Relations of Europe from the Nineteenth to the Mid-Twentieth Centuries" in Fred I. A. Omu and Leo E. Otoide (eds.) *Themes in International Studies and Diplomacy*, Benin City: Mindex Publishing, 2002, PP.100-101.
32. J. C. Johari, *International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post-Cold War Era*, New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited, 2014, P. 470.

33. Palmer and Perkin, *International Relations Third Revised Edition*, PP. 99-100.
34. Efebor Efevottu, "New Diplomacy: How New is the New Diplomacy Inaugurated in 1919?" [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350965803\\_NEW\\_DIPLOMACY\\_HOW\\_NEW\\_IS\\_THE\\_NEW\\_DIPLOMACY\\_INAUGURATED\\_IN\\_1919](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350965803_NEW_DIPLOMACY_HOW_NEW_IS_THE_NEW_DIPLOMACY_INAUGURATED_IN_1919) (Retrieved on 08/07/2023). Also See John T Rourke and Mark A. Boyer, *International Politics on World Stage*, Brief Fifth Edition, New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 2004, PP. 47-48.
35. Efevottu, "New Diplomacy ...
36. Efevottu, "New Diplomacy ...
37. Palmer and Perkins, *International Relations Third Revised Edition*, PP. 105-106.
38. Palmer and Perkins, *International Relations ...*, PP. 106-107.
39. Jovan Kurbalija, "Knowledge management and diplomacy" <https://www.diplomacy.edu/resource/knowledge-management-and-diplomacy/> (Retrieved on 10/07/2023).
40. Peacock, *A History of Modern Europe 1789-1970*, P. 331.
41. Peacock, *A History of Modern Europe ...*, P. 332.
42. Erhagbe and Okoh, "The International Relations of Europe from the Nineteenth to the Mid-Twentieth Centuries", P. 104.
43. Johari, *International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post-Cold War Era*, PP. 473-474.
44. Palmer and Perkins, *International Relations Third Revised Edition*, PP. 103.
45. John T. Rourke and Mark A. Boyer, *International Politics on the World Stage*, Brief Fifth Edition, New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc, 2004, PP. 206-208.
46. "Diplomacy since World War I" <https://www.britannica.com/topic/diplomacy/Diplomacy-since-World-War-I> (Retrieved on 18/07/2023).
47. Anthony and Ositadinma, *The Process of International Relations: Theories, Processes and Institutions*, P. 137.
48. Erhagbe and Okoh, "The International Relations of Europe from the Nineteenth to the Mid-Twentieth Centuries", P. 105. Also see Andrew Kourti, "The Long March to Peace: The Evolution from "Old Diplomacy" to "New Diplomacy" <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/10/09/the-long-march-to-peace-the-evolution-from-old-diplomacy-to-new-diplomacy> (Retrieved on 20/07/2023).