

DIPLOMACY

Every foreign policy has two sides—one is the making (formulation) of the policy, and the other its implementation. If national interest is associated with the formulation part, diplomacy is linked with the implementation part of a foreign policy. For the success of a foreign policy, the



role of diplomacy is very crucial. Diplomacy is that art which, throughout ages, has implemented foreign policy in reality. Put simply, foreign policy is applied through the instrument of diplomacy.

Diplomacy is an ancient instrument of foreign policy. The city-states of ancient Greece had diplomatic links with one another. According to the famous Greek political philosopher Thucydides, the ancient Greek city-states developed a very well-structured diplomatic link in around 500 BC. This ancient art is still alive in the twenty-first century, despite many challenges and transformations. Its basic norm has, however, remained the same: diplomacy is an instrument through which states maintain relations among themselves.

Definition

It is possible to define the term 'diplomacy' in simple words. As already mentioned, it is an instrument through which countries maintain relations with one another. According to *The Oxford English Dictionary*, Diplomacy is 'the management of international relations by negotiation' or 'the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed'. Theoretically, diplomacy is different from foreign policy. A foreign policy is applied through diplomacy, but diplomacy has nothing to do with the making of foreign policy. In other words, the concept of foreign policy has a much wider perspective. Besides diplomacy, other instruments are required for the successful implementation of foreign policy. Diplomacy is one of the instruments for the application of foreign policy. In that sense, diplomacy as a concept is narrower in scope than foreign policy. After this analysis, a modern and simple definition of diplomacy may be attempted: *Diplomacy is the method of communication among governments for the maintenance of international relations.*

Main Tasks of Diplomacy

Diplomacy as an instrument of foreign policy performs several important functions. Hans J. Morgenthau in his book *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* identified four major tasks of diplomacy. These are: (1) to determine the major objectives of the state, and the power actually available to fulfill these objectives; (2) diplomacy must assess the objectives of other states and the power actually available to fulfill these objectives; (3) diplomacy must assess to what extent these objectives are compatible with each other; (4) diplomacy must employ the means suited to the pursuit of its objectives. According to Morgenthau, 'Failure in any one of these tasks may jeopardize the success of foreign policy and with it the peace of the world.' In his analysis of these four tasks of diplomacy, he opines that the first major task of diplomacy is to assess the objectives and aspirations of one's own nation. These objectives must be determined in the light of the power actually available to the state to fulfill such objectives. If any nation sets objectives that it has little power to achieve, it would indulge in inept diplomacy. Therefore, every nation must set its objectives in accordance with its national power.

Further, it is not enough to assess one's own objectives and powers; diplomacy must also assess the objectives of other nations and the actual powers available to them to fulfill such objectives. This is the second major task of diplomacy. This is not an easy task, as assessing others' objectives and powers is extremely difficult. It involves guesswork, examining the available information in a pragmatic manner, and shrewd calculations. Diplomacy must not view others' powers and objectives casually and, at the same time, it must not eulogize the powers and objectives of other nations. Therefore, this continuous assessment process is difficult, yet a vital function of diplomacy.

The third major function of diplomacy, according to Morgenthau, is to determine to what extent the objectives are compatible to each other. This means that a diplomat must continuously compare the objectives and powers of his nation with the objectives and actual powers of other nations. For example, Indian diplomacy must assess the objectives and powers of India with those of China or Pakistan or USA. This is again not an easy task, and it requires adequate efficiency to perform this function.

The fourth important task of diplomacy, as per Morgenthau's view, is to employ suitable means to fulfill the objectives of his nation. Diplomacy must employ all possible means to achieve its goals. A skilled diplomat will employ methods according to the demands of the situation. Diplomacy may engage in negotiation, persuasion, appeal, or use the threat of force. An excessive emphasis on a particular method may be detrimental to foreign policy. Therefore, diplomacy uses a combination of means to fulfill a nation's objectives. A weak nation with little military power, however, cannot use the threat of force to fulfill its objectives.

Morgenthau analysed the functions of diplomacy in the context of power. Morgenthau, an exponent of the Realist Theory in International Relations, believed that political power is a key element in international as well as domestic politics. He tried to analyse international relations in terms of power. Therefore, in his analysis of the functions of diplomacy, Morgenthau also used the concept of power. But such an analysis of diplomacy in the light of power is not above controversy. Continuous assessment of powers and objectives may not be accurate. Even if a diplomat can assess the power of his nation, it is impossible for him to assess the powers of other nations very accurately. However, in Morgenthau's 'four tasks of diplomacy', the essential duty of a diplomat may be observed: a diplomat will always apply his reason and wisdom to assess his objectives and also that of other nations. In this context, it is necessary to analyse the functions of diplomats. Diplomacy as an instrument of foreign policy is actually put into practice by the diplomats. Countries communicate with one another mainly through diplomats, even in this age of technologically-driven communication channels. Therefore, it is essential to know the functions of diplomats.

Functions of Diplomats

Norman D. Palmer and Howard C. Perkins identified four major functions of diplomats. These are: (1) representation; (2) negotiation; (3) reporting; and (4) protection of the interests of the nation and its citizens in foreign lands. These functions are essentially vital for the success of diplomacy, and require careful analysis.

Representation

A diplomat represents his country in a foreign land. All diplomats are, in this sense, the chief representatives of their countries in an alien land. For example, the Indian Ambassador to the USA officially represents India in America. This function of representation is important as well as sensitive. The personality of diplomats, their conversational skills, behavioural patterns, social contacts in their place of posting, all are very crucial for their success as a diplomat and for the success of the foreign policy of their country. A diplomat bridges two countries, their own states and the states where they are working. Their main duties are to implement the foreign policies of their governments and to protect the national interests of their countries in the alien land. For exercising their duties successfully, they have to cultivate social contacts on foreign

land. They must establish contacts, among others, with leading politicians, bureaucrats, intellectuals, the military, and business persons. Through their social contacts, they can 'sell' the foreign policies of their countries successfully. But at the same time, they must be very careful about their social relationships, because these may be misused by vested interests. If diplomats do not cultivate their social relations carefully, their own images and the images of their countries may suffer. A diplomat's functions can be compared with that of a 'salesman'. Like a successful 'salesman', a successful diplomat has to develop an attractive personality and important social contacts to 'sell' their products. Here, their 'products' are their national interests and foreign policies. They must 'sell' the national interests of his country effectively in the foreign land. Their governments are heavily dependent on them for the successful implementation of their foreign policies and for the protection of their national interests. The function of representation is thus very important for the diplomats as well as for their country.

Negotiation

An important technique of diplomacy is negotiation. The success of diplomacy depends upon successful negotiation. A successful diplomat, in other words, must be an able negotiator. He may have to participate in bilateral, trilateral and multilateral negotiations, and for each type he may have to adopt different approaches. In international relations, it is possible to solve problems or diffuse tensions through negotiation. The art of negotiation involves a diplomat's ability to influence others, his power of persuasion through conversational skills, knowledge about prevailing international politics, wisdom about how and when to move forward or backward. Diplomats have to be very good calculators of events, time and space. A problem that the diplomat faces as a negotiator is how much to compromise and how much to claim, without sacrificing his national interest. A skilled diplomat can strike a fine balance between the two. The success of a foreign policy and the prestige of a nation often depend on successful negotiation. Therefore, this function of diplomacy is very important as well as sensitive for the diplomat.

Reporting

This is another significant function of the diplomat. According to Palmer and Perkins, the report that a diplomat sends from his place of posting to his native land can be treated as the 'raw material' for the foreign policy of his country. A diplomat must analyse the social, economic, and political conditions of his country of work and send an unbiased report to his government. So, a diplomat must have adequate knowledge about the socio-economic-political milieu of his country of posting. Moreover, his reports can determine the course of bilateral relations. For example, the Indian Ambassador to the United States (US) would submit periodical reports to the Government of India, citing not only the socio-economic-political conditions in the US, but also issues like bilateral trade and commerce, the scope for Indian business in the US and vice versa, and the future political and economic scenario in the US. He would also report about the attitude of important political leaders and legislators toward India. His reports would also highlight, among others, the present scenario and the future possibilities of India-US educational, scientific, strategic and cultural exchanges. The Indian government would study his reports carefully and take policy decisions with regard to bilateral relations with the US, based on such reports. This shows the significance of the function of the reportings of the diplomat. An objective, unbiased and impartial report is always treated as a very good source material for foreign policy.

Protection of the Interest of the Nation and Its Citizens in Foreign Land

A diplomat has the responsibility to protect the interest of his nation and its citizens in his country of work. As per provisions of different bilateral and international treaties and agreements, a diplomat shall protect the interests of his nation and its citizens in a foreign land. The Indian Ambassador in Japan, for example, shall protect the interests of the citizens of India in Japan. Indian citizens can contact the Indian Embassy in Tokyo during any crisis or mishap like natural disaster, wreckage of ships or accidents. Similarly, American citizens can contact their embassy in any country for help during any kind of crisis—personal, natural or socio-political. A diplomat also tries to promote his nation in a foreign land. Diplomats endeavour to promote the culture, education, trade and commerce, tourism of their country in their land of work. For this purpose, they organize seminars, symposia, exhibitions, tours, and investment or educational fairs in foreign land to attract local people towards their country. In these seminars and fairs, they highlight the policies of their governments and try to draw the attention of the local people towards these policies. Hence, this function is one of the significant aspects of successful diplomacy.

Open and Secret Diplomacy

Diplomacy, since its inception to the later part of the nineteenth century, was a clandestine affair. So, for a very large period diplomatic activities were conducted secretly. It was believed that since diplomacy is integrally linked with national interest, it would be wise to keep it a secret for the benefit of the nation. There are myriad examples of secret treaties—products of secret diplomacy—in international politics. The Berlin Congress Treaty of 1878 was kept a secret. The Sykes-Picot Agreement between France and Russia in 1916 was also kept in the dark. Before that, the 'Entente Cordiale' (Treaty of Friendship) between Britain and France in 1904 was surreptitiously conducted. Even several provisions of the Yalta Agreement of 1945 were created behind the curtain. The causes for secret diplomacy, as revealed later, were national interest and war-time exigencies. But one definite reason behind secret diplomacy was the fear of adverse public reaction towards certain treaties or agreements. Because of this fear, several treaties that had the potential to ignite public passion were kept secret.

From the first half of the twentieth century, the demand for open diplomacy gained ground. People started to denounce secret diplomacy mainly for two reasons: the spread of democratic ideas and the hatred that a nation incurred due to secret diplomacy. Gradually the demand for treaties concluded in full public view, and ratified by the Parliament, gained popularity. Woodrow Wilson, the former US President, was an ardent supporter of open diplomacy. In his address before the US Congress in 1918, Wilson called for full public knowledge about every treaty or agreement signed by governments. After that, the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Charter of the United Nations proclaimed full support for open diplomacy. The complexities created in international politics by secret diplomacy during the First World War and before it, also inspired people to support open diplomacy.

Open diplomacy has two features: (1) rejection of the conclusion of secret treaties; (2) conducting of diplomatic negotiations in full public glare. But experts like Joseph Frankel and others have questioned whether it is possible in reality to go for open diplomacy. Frankel supports the demand for the rejection of secret treaties, because secret treaties contradict the ideals of democracy. But he is sceptical about the success of open diplomacy. He feels that open diplomacy can bring embarrassment for a nation. Diplomats use various shrewd methods in diplomatic dialogues—they

often utter what they do not mean, and do not utter what they mean. They may regularly retract from verbal promises made by them. They may have to do this for the protection of their national interest. But it would be impossible for diplomats to use all their shrewd calculations in full public glare. Once they promise something before the people, they would not be able to retract. Their national interests may then suffer, thinks Frankel. Several other experts like Harold Nicolson, Walter Lippmann, Palmer, Perkins, Sisley Huddleston and Morgenthau have described the concept of open diplomacy as unrealistic. According to these scholars, political leaders would propagate open diplomacy in order to get public support, but in practice they would follow the rules of secret diplomacy, because diplomacy and national interest are inseparable.

There is truth in the view that open diplomacy is not realistically possible even in this age of globalization and democracy. No democratic country can afford to bring all diplomatic negotiations to light. For national security purposes, all democratic nations keep some areas of diplomacy secret. But nowadays treaties are not kept out of public knowledge as most of them require the ratification of the national Parliament, although not all the details of diplomacy are brought to light. In fact, the debate on secret versus open diplomacy is still very strong. While democratic ideas demand open diplomacy, national security concerns support the rules of secret diplomacy. This debate would be stronger in the future with the spread of democratic ideals across the globe.

Economic Diplomacy

Economic diplomacy has assumed enormous significance since the onset of globalization and gained popularity in every part of the world after the Cold War. *Economic diplomacy means enhancing cooperation with other states through increasing trade and commercial relations. Economic diplomacy avoids political differences, and places greater emphasis on strengthening friendship through economic cooperation.* During the Cold War, the bipolar nature of world politics created an atmosphere of political and military rivalry. The world suffered from the fear of a real, devastating war between the two superpowers, which were nuclear states. In this atmosphere of tension and rivalry, diplomacy was mainly dominated by political and military issues. The end of the Cold War in 1991 created a unipolar world where intense military and political rivalry were no longer witnessed. In the absence of bloc politics, nations gave more attention to economic diplomacy. In a changed international order after the Cold War, economic diplomacy gradually gained momentum in different parts of the world.

However, we must remember in this context that economic diplomacy began its journey immediately after the Second World War. The Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan or the Warsaw Pact were forms of economic diplomacy in some way or the other. The main aim of all these programmes and pacts was to strengthen relations with countries through economic assistance. Economic diplomacy was born during the Cold War, but gained momentum after it. As stated already, economic diplomacy sets aside political differences and concentrates on trade and commercial relations, following several techniques. It tries to enhance trade with other countries, creates investment opportunities, establishes economic zones and free trade areas for hassle free trade, and encourages free movement of labour and capital. The onset of globalization gave a fillip to economic diplomacy. By the 1980s, third world countries had started liberalizing their economies. This liberalization programme had presented an unprecedented opportunity to the developed world to engage in economic diplomacy with the third world countries. On the other hand, the third world countries also grabbed this opportunity and got themselves seriously involved in economic diplomacy with the developed world.

The best example of how economic diplomacy sets aside political differences is the recent US-China bilateral relationship. From the political point of view, the US and China stand far apart. The US has a liberal democratic political system, whereas in China a one-party system exists. American politicians and legislators complain regularly about violation of democratic and human rights in China. Official American documents like the Annual Human Rights Report, released by the State Department, regularly place China in the group of countries that violate human rights and democratic freedoms of the people. Yet China and the US share a very strong economic relationship. At present (2010), the amount of American investment in China is more than ten times the amount of American investment in India. China's huge market and its socialist market economy have attracted American investment in a massive way. Despite political differences, the US and China are engaged in serious economic diplomacy. The latter is now the fourth largest trading partner of the former. Therefore, it can be stated that economic diplomacy has set aside political differences between the two states. Other countries, especially India and Pakistan, can emulate this trend of economic diplomacy as provided by the US and China. Economic proximity between these traditional rivals can obliterate political differences and can generate a new era of cooperation in South Asia. Nevertheless, economic diplomacy has definitely ushered in new optimism in international relations.

Future of Diplomacy

In an age of spectacular development of information technology, the role and importance of professional diplomats are coming under scrutiny. Now two Heads of Government can directly communicate between themselves over telephone, fax, e-mail or video-conferencing and discuss necessary political and related issues. The services of a professional diplomat may not be necessary in this case. This trend has raised doubts over the future of diplomacy. For a long time, from the birth of diplomacy in ancient Greece to the Second World War, professional diplomats were the undisputed channels of diplomacy. But since the Second World War, due to the unprecedented development of science and technology, traditional notion of diplomacy faced a crisis. Moreover, with the spread of democratic ideals and growing demands for open diplomacy, the traditional form of diplomacy is also facing a crisis. Democratic institutions like the Parliament, media and peoples' organizations are trying to influence the process of diplomacy. The world of diplomacy is, therefore, no longer the exclusive domain of the professional diplomats only; science and technology and democratic ideals have made deep inroads into this exclusive world.

What is the role of diplomacy then? If the prime ministers of India and Britain can directly talk over telephone or video-conferencing and solve all problems, where does the diplomat fit in? This question may strengthen doubts about the future of diplomacy. But at this juncture, it must be pointed out that neither diplomacy nor the importance of the diplomats have dwindled over the years. When two heads of government are talking directly, they are also engaged in diplomacy; and in this case it is known as direct diplomacy. Moreover, when the prime ministers of India and Britain are talking over telephone, the groundwork and issues for such talks have been prepared by the diplomats, because the politicians are not always very well acquainted with every detail of foreign policies. This is why when the heads of government meet directly, they are accompanied by senior diplomats and bureaucrats. Moreover, every nation carries out diplomatic missions in other countries in order to maintain healthy relations with others, as well as to protect its national interest and implement its foreign policy in other nations. The role of the diplomats is very crucial in this context. If diplomacy had lost its relevance, countries would not have spent enormous sums

to maintain diplomatic missions abroad. Even in this age of advanced information technology and globalization, diplomacy is mainly used by professional diplomats who use science and technology to sharpen the art. Diplomacy is not conducted by politicians frequently as they are not aware of its tricks and as they do not have the time to pursue it. If any politician tries to take too much interest in diplomacy, his political career and the interest of his state would suffer. Therefore, he prefers to leave it to the diplomat and seek his advice when meeting, or talking over phone to, fellow politicians from foreign lands.

PROPAGANDA

Propaganda is an important technique by which foreign policy aims to succeed. In ancient times, the ruling class used the technique of propaganda to influence people to accept its programmes and views. But scientific propaganda, according to Joseph Frankel, started its journey in the early twentieth century. Till the First World War (1914–18), the importance of propaganda in international relations was negligible. American and Western European scholars believe that during the inter-war period (1919–39), the former Soviet Union and Nazi Germany used propaganda extensively to garner support for their views and programmes. Since then, the use of science and technology for propaganda started in a huge way, and the journey of scientific propaganda began.

Definition

The idea of propaganda was first initiated by the Roman Catholic Church. According to Frankel, the Church 'had institutionalized the propagation of faith through a special Sacred Congregation (*de propaganda fide*) from the title of which the word "propaganda" is derived' (Frankel 1977: 131). The British Government during the First World War, and later, Soviet Union and Germany, started scientific propaganda in support of their views and programmes. Propaganda may be simply defined as follows: *A systematic attempt to influence the minds and emotions of a target group for a specific purpose. For propaganda radio, TV, print media and Internet are used in modern times.*

Propaganda is different from diplomacy. In the first place, diplomacy is a government-to-government affair, whereas propaganda is aimed at the people of other states. For instance, during the Cold War, Soviet propaganda was aimed at the populace of the US and West Europe; whereas American propaganda was aimed at the populace of the Soviet Union and East European countries. At the same time, the respective propaganda were also used to influence the minds of their own people as well. Secondly, diplomacy may sometimes consider the interests of other nations, but propaganda is intensely self-centred. It is not possible for any propaganda to highlight the policies and programmes of other nations. The sole purpose of a propagandist is to highlight the interest of his own nation and affect the minds of others. Propaganda only glorifies the propagandist nation, it does not think of others. Thirdly, while diplomacy has positive impact on international relations, propaganda contributes nothing positive to it. According to Frankel, propaganda, due to its selfish state-centric character, only contributes negatively to international relations. Self-seeking propaganda, glorifying the policies and programmes of a particular nation, may generate a negative mindset in other countries. This only breeds hatred and animosity in international relations. Diplomacy and propaganda are thus different, although they are both very useful arms of foreign policy.

Techniques

A successful propaganda may effectively be compared with advertising and sales. Like an advertiser or a salesperson, propagandists must fix their target group and area of operation and have adequate knowledge about them (the area in this case is a state). A propagandist must analyse, like an advertiser, the demands, aspirations, emotions and fears of his target group, as also the socio-economic-political milieu of his area of operation, and invent appropriate methods of propaganda. Propaganda has several methods. Palmer and Perkins have summarized all these methods to finally provide four important techniques of propaganda: (1) methods of presentation; (2) techniques of gaining attention; (3) devices for gaining response; and (4) methods of gaining acceptance. These techniques are analysed here.

Methods of Presentation

The success of propaganda is highly dependent on the presentation of issues. The acceptance of any propaganda depends on its art of presentation. A propagandist can transform a lie or a half-lie into truth, and vice versa, through their ability of presentation. Palmer and Perkins cited a very good example of how Nazi Germany used a wrong document to ignite anti-Jew sentiments successfully among the Christians in Europe. According to them, Hitler's Nazi administration aptly exploited as 'proof' a document titled *Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion* to spread the message that the Jews were hatching a conspiracy against the Christians to rule the world. This propaganda created anti-Jew sentiments in Europe and served Hitler's purpose. However, it was discovered later that the infamous protocol was designed by a section of the Tsarist police to topple Tsarist rule in Russia.

During the Cold War, both the US and the Soviet Union resorted to convincing propaganda. The Soviet Union, in all its official documents, projected the picture of a very strong and solid economy. It, however, became evident after the disintegration of the Soviet Union that the Soviet economy was in poor shape. The Soviet Union had to resort to such propaganda to protect its image of a superpower and to compete with the US during the Cold War period. The purpose of a propagandist is to win the confidence of his target-group by any means. Before attacking Iraq in 2003, the US had declared that it had 'clear evidence' to 'prove' that Iraq was stockpiling WMDs (weapons of mass destruction). But till date, no such 'evidence' has been found in Iraq. Behind this propaganda, the purpose of the US was to mobilize public opinion against Iraq. The purpose was fulfilled. Several such examples could be cited from international politics to show how the art of presentation made propaganda successful.

Techniques of Gaining Attention

After presentation, the next target of the propagandist is to gain the attention of his target group. The propagandist adopts various means to gain attention. To attract the attention of the government of another country, methods like TV or radio speech, open letters, protest marches are arranged. Where the target group is the people of another country, several other methods are followed. A very subtle yet sober method is to run educational and cultural missions in foreign lands to spread the policies and programmes of a particular state. Organizations like The United States Information Agency or the British Council are spread across the globe to implement the programmes and policies of the US and the British governments respectively. Besides providing

services like library facilities to the people in a foreign land, these missions also attract the attention of the local people towards the policies of their governments through seminars, exhibitions and workshops. In today's world, the technique of gaining attention through direct show of military strength has become almost obsolete. Yet, rich nations try to show their prowess indirectly. The posh, air-conditioned, sophisticated educational and cultural missions silently announce the economic prosperity of the US or Britain. The rich industrial nations also promise to give economic or military assistance to other countries. Such promises are generally accompanied by extensive propaganda. Normally, declarations for economic or military assistance are made during the visits of the heads of government to a foreign land, because such visits are covered extensively by the media in both countries. Thus, when the US President visits India, several American assistance or cooperation programmes are normally announced before the American and the Indian media. The visits of the heads of government are now exploited by every country to gain attention to its foreign policy. During such visits, extensive propaganda on friendship and cooperation are taken up. Although propaganda is a continuous activity, it may become forceful at certain times, like the visits of heads of government. The availability of modern tools such as satellite TV, radio, internet, fax and mobile services has added more teeth to propaganda. Nowadays, even the terrorist groups are taking the benefits of modern methods to gain public attention toward their policies.

Devices for Gaining Response

A major aim of propaganda is to elicit response from the target group. The propagandist follows various methods to elicit response. They use sentimental appeal, nationalism, the emotion of the people—of their own nations and that of others, too—as well as reason, to gain response to their propaganda. A very effective method is the use of slogans to ignite the passion of people. Slogans like 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' or 'Workers of the world unite' or 'Herr Hitler' touched the emotions of the people to a great extent and elicited tremendous response. In independent India, slogans like '*Garibi hatao*' (eradicate poverty) or 'Green Revolution' or '*Hum do Hamaare do*' (we are two, we have two) became very popular as well as effective to attract people's attention to different domestic programmes. Apart from slogans, the use of national flags, symbols and images are quite frequent in eliciting responses from the people. The American 'eagle', British 'lion' or Indian 'lion pillars of Asoka' (Asokastamva) can ignite a sense of nationalism. According to Palmer and Perkins, the 'Swastika' symbol of Nazi Germany generated intense nationalistic feelings and emotional attachments. Sometimes, charismatic appeal by individual leaders is used to garner response from the people. Mahatma Gandhi, Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, Abraham Lincoln, Hitler and Mussolini, to name a few, had such charismatic appeal. Nowadays, the charisma of renowned personalities from the world of sports or of cinema, besides that of political leaders, is used to gain support for official policies. They are frequently used as a part of propaganda to elicit popular response as its impact over public opinion is quite high.

Methods of Gaining Acceptance

A propagandist uses different methods to make his campaign acceptable to people. He tries to project himself as very friendly to his target group. If the propagandist can successfully convey the message that 'I am one of you,' his chances of getting accepted are always high. During elections, candidates use this strategy in all countries. Even politically and financially strong candidates try

to establish a 'people's man' image of theirs to garner support. A clever portrayal of this image can help them win elections. The propagandist also invokes religion or sycophancy around a national icon, or talks in terms of morality, ethics and altruism to make his propaganda acceptable. In international relations, states also try to make their propaganda acceptable on similar lines. For example, India frequently refers to the Gandhian principle of non-violence and peaceful coexistence in its foreign policy. The United States of America termed its invasion of Iraq as 'humanitarian intervention', required urgently to establish human rights in Iraq. In this instance, the US tried to make its policy acceptable to the world by invoking the principle of morality.

A propagandist has to adopt various methods, depending upon his target-group and area, to make his propaganda sharp and successful. Appropriate and meaningful propaganda is essential for the success of foreign policy and protection of national interests. Therefore, all nations try to have an effective propaganda machinery. Successful propaganda, however, is not an easy task. It demands intellect, money and adequate infrastructure. It is frequently observed that, in this, rich nations are ahead of poor nations who lack money and infrastructure to launch massive propaganda operations in support of their policies and programmes.

MILITARY AND FOREIGN POLICY

The role of the military is very significant to the implementation of any foreign policy. It is easy for a nation with a strong military to protect its national interest and successfully implement its foreign policy. History does not provide any example to the contrary. For nearly 300 years, when the system of 'Balance of Power' was prevalent in international politics, five to six European powers controlled the course of international politics. These European powers were Britain, France, Germany, Holland, Spain, and Portugal. All these nations had great military strength. Their military and economic strength put them ahead of others in the race for the control of world affairs. They were strong in conventional arms than others. But, after the Second World War, with the introduction of nuclear arms, these European powers were no longer in a position to occupy a key role in world politics. Their economies were devastated by the war. And, they were not nuclear-weapon states when they fought the war. Consequently, their three-hundred years of domination of world politics was compromised and their role as determinants of world politics was reduced to the minimum.

Bipolarity became prevalent in international relations after the Second World War. The US and the Soviet Union, the two military superpowers, took the lead as controllers of international politics. Both were nuclear powers. Simultaneously, they maintained big armies and huge reserves of conventional weapons. They used to spend enormous sums for the maintenance of their military and armaments. After the end of the Cold War, the US has emerged as the only superpower. The US is very strong militarily and economically. As a result, it can control international politics after the Cold War. Therefore, it has been observed in this brief analysis covering a period of four hundred years—from the beginning of the Balance of Power system to the end of the Cold War—that only nations strong in military could always control international politics; not states with weak military power.

It must be mentioned in this context that economic strength is necessary to establish a nation as a military power, because the maintenance of powerful and a big armed force is highly expensive. As discussed earlier, the European nations had to depart as leaders of international politics due

to the devastation of their economies during the Second World War. It became impossible for them to maintain a strong military, and consequently, their power receded. The Soviet Union had to spend excessive money to maintain its status as a military superpower during the Cold War period. But subsequently, the Soviet economy was unable to afford this huge spending on its military. According to experts like Peter Calvocoressi and Norman D. Palmer, this was one of the causes for the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Therefore a strong military always demands an equally strong economy.

It is normally believed that the role of the military in foreign policy is limited in a democracy, because democracy ensures civilian rule. But this view is not altogether true. The role of the military is quite significant in the implementation (and making) of foreign policy in a democracy as well. A former US President declared after the Second World War that the future of America would be ruled by the politician-military-industry combine. His views were proved correct. In present-day America, the role of this combine is extremely significant not only in domestic politics, but in its foreign policy as well. During the long forty-five years of the Cold War, the US military played a crucial role in America's foreign policy. The military was frequently consulted for the making and the implementation of the American foreign policy during this time. After the Cold War, in recent times, the US military also played an extremely meaningful role in the US foreign policy with regard to Iraq, Afghanistan and other nations of the world. The military is a significant factor in the foreign policy of other democratic countries like Britain and India as well.

The military also plays a very active role in the making and implementation of foreign policy in other forms of government (one-party and totalitarian) as well. In the one-party systems of the former Soviet Union and east European socialist countries, as well as in present-day China, the role of the military in foreign policy has been quite prominent. During the Cold War, the Soviet military, like its American counterpart, was always consulted in foreign policy matters. China also gives importance to its military in the making of foreign policy and its implementation. For instance, the proposal to solve any problem at the China-India border, or any agreement between them on this issue, requires the endorsement of the Chinese (as also Indian) military. Although such an agreement is normally proposed and signed by civilian rulers, they seek the approval of the military before proposing or signing the agreement. This example shows the importance of the military in foreign policy matters in one-party, totalitarian and democratic political systems. Needless to say, the military is all-in-all in military dictatorships in case of both domestic and foreign policy matters. The men in uniform in such a system enjoy direct exercise of state power; theirs is the last voice in domestic as well as foreign policy issues.

The idea that the military is required only at wartime is not true. The example cited above—a proposal or an agreement between India and China to solve any border-related problem must be endorsed by the military—is not one from the period of any war. Such agreements may be signed during peace as well. If the military of both the countries do not support this proposal or agreement, be it at the time of war or of peace, the proposal would be dropped from the foreign policy agenda. Therefore, the role of the military is very crucial in foreign policy making and implementation during peace time as well. Military support plays an instrumental role in making a foreign policy successful. During a war, this help can be direct; at the time of peace, it can be either direct or indirect. In the latter case, people may or may not have any knowledge about it. In today's world, although any direct manifestation of power is seldom observed, yet every state wants to use its military as a 'backup force' behind its foreign policy. The presence of a strong military helps a state protect its national interests and pursue its foreign policy effectively.

