

Modern Diplomacy in Pakistan and Afghanistan: Navigating Complexities and Building Connections

Dr. Muhammad Asim

Assistant Professor at the Government Graduate College Asghar Mall (Rawalpindi), and the Honorary Vice-President at the Pak-Iran Intellectuals Forum (Islamabad Office)

Tariq Saeed (Corresponding Author)

Research Fellow at the Department of International Relations, Coventry University Coventry, (UK)

Email: tariqsaeed55@yahoo.com

Publication History:

Received: March 28, 2022

Revised: March 30, 2023

Accepted: April 12, 2023

Published Online: May 01, 2023

Keywords:

State-to-State Interactions,
Traditional Diplomats,
Economic Diplomacy,
Post-Cold War Era,
Two-Stage Techniques,
Conventional Multilateralism,

Research related to Academic Areas:

Pakistan Studies, Constitutional Studies, International Relations

Acknowledgment:

Author 02 wrote this paper while, **Author 01** assisted him regarding theoretical work covering Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Ethical Consideration:

This study has no aim to hurt any ideological or social segment but purely based on academic purposes.

Abstract

This paper discusses the evolution of diplomacy in the context of Pakistan and Afghanistan. The traditional form of diplomacy, which involves state-to-state interactions, has been challenged by the complex and dynamic nature of the relationship between these two countries. Pakistan and Afghanistan have a shared history, culture, and geography, but also have significant political, economic, and security challenges that have hindered their ability to build a stable and productive relationship. This paper explores the various forms of modern diplomacy, including economic, cultural, and digital diplomacy, that have emerged in recent years and have the potential to help facilitate a more positive and constructive relationship between Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Copyright © 2023 IPICS Journal as an academic research-oriented non-profit initiative of Rehmat and Maryam Researches (SMC-Pvt) Limited, publishing from Islamabad, Rawalpindi, and Lodhran under the registration from Security and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP). This is an open-access article. However, its distribution and/or reproduction in any medium is subject to the proper citation of the original work.

Introduction

Diplomacy is a recognized way to persuade other countries & peoples to change their policies and behavior via negotiations, dialogue, as well as other non-violent means. The European state structure of the post-Renaissance is responsible for modern diplomatic procedures. In the past, diplomacy referred to the management of formal (often bilateral) ties between independent governments. But by the 20th century, European diplomatic innovations had spread around the world, and the definition of diplomacy had grown to include summit meetings and some other conferences, parliaments diplomacy, worldwide

endeavors of supranational as well as subnational entities, informal diplomacy by non-profit organizations actors, and also the work of global civil servants (Freeman, 1998).

Inside the history of international relationships in the modern era, there seem to be two widely held beliefs regarding diplomacy. The first claims that World War One marked a crucial turning point throughout modern history and the creation of a new diplomacy that was different from what had come before in terms of both its core and its style. According to the second, diplomacy is always deteriorating. This study suggests that the distinction between conventional and emerging diplomacy is oversimplified and inaccurate, and also that the claim that diplomacy is in decline is unfounded. Raymond on claims that “diplomacy, in the conventional sense of the term, functions slightly higher compared up to a specific degree among both allies, and hardly all that much longer between many enemies, or between these same blocs land also the impartial nations” is only partially true and reflects its moment of writing just at end of the Cold War (Freeman, 1998).

In this paper, it is being discussed how diplomacy has evolved significantly since the turn of the twenty-first century.

Before getting into the specifics, let me briefly describe classic and contemporary diplomacy.

What is Traditional Diplomacy?

The classic definition of diplomacy comprises interactions between administrations and states. Traditional diplomats’ endeavor to advance the country’s interests that fit within the scope of the government’s strategic objectives in international affairs and aim to secure these interests by establishing a connection between leading members of foreign nations. Traditional diplomacy, according to McCullin, general diplomatic adviser to the US State Department, is (state-to-state diplomacy). In public diplomacy, efforts are made to persuade public officials in different countries to adopt particular stances (Khawani,1386).

In terms of the diplomatic goals that nations seek to achieve, economic and military issues are examples of economic or military diplomacy. The term “economic diplomacy” describes the intersection of national and international economic activity and diplomacy. Furthermore, at the level of something like the global system of worldwide political economy, there is a common division among all of each state’s political, economic, and cultural aspects. As a result, modern liberalism has positioned economic diplomacy as among the most effective tools inside the international system to support traditional diplomacy, fill gaps, and address emerging needs of nations in the sphere of international economy inside the post-Cold War era and also with the development of globalization processes. Economic diplomacy can be characterized more broadly as the comprehensiveness of strategic activities, coordinated proposals, and economic and political common understanding in the national and international spheres that can also be applied in the foreign policy decisions of jurisdictions in the national and international fields of the international economy (Salihi, 1392). By applying pressure towards the requested nation, a current regime that employs military freedom through its international policies hopes to persuade it to carefully examine the behavioral patterns of its international policy in terms of the power structure of nationwide objectives and objectives in addition to declarations of foreign policy views. Achieving several military strategic goals is not required to use military freedom. Governments may play the military card to restore their once-prominent status or to satisfy social, economic, and political demands (Qawam, 1388). Cultural differences

were unwelcome, even though globalization occurred in the 1960s and the tense post-Cold War era, because heads of something like the two poles—the United States of America and the Soviet Union—determined the nature of such relationships between the different elements of the international order. Following the ending of the Cold War and the enormous changes in industry and infrastructure that followed, governments and those with stakes in international affairs began to place a high priority on cultural problems and the analysis of politics and diplomatic relations from a semantic as well as cultural perspective. Governments tend to utilize this weapon to promote national goals and interests in the age of globalization and the spread of communication technologies to draw attention to cultural issues. Today, we see the creation and development of cultural committees with unions on a worldwide scale, which gives rise to the issues that give rise to global disputes and challenges and serve as a catalyst for improved relations between citizens and governments. Therefore, achieving prestige both domestically and abroad as well as swaying public opinion, or, in other words, mastering soft power, are some of the crucial and approved goals of state diplomacy in the realm of international politics. Additionally, this uses various methods and approaches depending on the location, status, possibilities, and cultural skills of each nation. Therefore, to have the ability to wield power in addition to its political authority, governments work to broaden their understanding and cultural framework, disseminate their values or disciplines, and promote their views. It attempts to sway global public opinion in favor of its objectives and interests by using the tactic of cultural influence rather than the use of force (Arjomand, 1392).

What is Modern Diplomacy?

The digital revolution that emerged and grew in the context of the globalization trend in the post-Cold War era is a joke that needs to be taken seriously when discussing the subject of modern diplomacy. However, contemporary public statesmanship is a modern thing that has scattered and flourished in light of telecommunications and information revolutionary movements. Diplomacy has evolved into a sequence of very well policies between many diplomats, despite this. It is the result of worrying and concentrating on previous tasks. The distinction behind them is that existing public diplomacy refers to a shift in strategy from disseminating information among addressees overseas to the tendency towards direct connection with them (Mellisen, 2005). The alteration in the global environmental circumstances was the cause of this. First of all, we are seeing the rise of a modernist government that is simply a component of the complex relationships with those other actors, despite the need for it to be prepared to respond to consequences. The worldwide political square, which is dependent on advancements in connection, load, and transit technology, emerged alongside these impacts when international public universities attempted to address some universal issues including the environment, civil rights, and social equity on a worldwide scale. If sending signals unilaterally by countries proves to be a losing approach in the age of networks, the traditional model of diplomacy is under pressure to establish a non-hierarchical system (Khorshidi, 1394). This new method is focused on including all group initiatives and tactics. Instead of seeing foreigners as targets, it sees them as powerful activists. The use of communication in both traditional and contemporary public diplomacy is the key distinction between them. In other words, the contemporary public diplomatic system is centered around the network, whereas the classic diplomatic system is a hierarchical structure cantered around a block. The type of hierarchy organization that was decided to expand during the post-cold war era by the United States is conceptually near to the propaganda apparatus and continues to follow the policy of corporate strategy public diplomacy again for

transfer of information from the higher levels towards the bottom layer of something like the target groups. (Hocking, 2005). Thus, two-stage techniques are the foundation of conventional public diplomacy. It can accomplish its objective by influencing global opinion, which in turn affects how other nations conduct their foreign relations. As a result, this sort of diplomacy defends the kind of interaction that employs the transmission of offensively prepared information to elicit carrots. However, this pattern provides governments with good results (Metzl, 2001).

The network structure, on the other hand, is a response to the global changes that are being brought about by cultural variety, the rise of activists, and the development of interactive media. Decentralization is another feature of this architecture. As a result, it is important to emphasize the need to establish principles and standards rather than giving any one-party unlimited power. This pattern seeks to build partnerships based on mutual advantages in the context of addressing common cross-border issues to promote action in regions where governments by themselves can play a significant role. To accommodate additional activists and the efficient application of specialized sciences, this pattern naturally builds on dispersed membership and semi-organizations. To achieve political objectives, network diplomacy necessitates modifications to the engagement model and liberalization of the constructivist competence, both of which are based just on the block and utilize the dissemination of global media to transmit particular messages to something like a wide range of stable and immovable interlocutors. But at the other hand, contemporary public diplomacy emphasizes the networking strategy that relies on the development of close relationships with citizens of other countries as both a goal within itself as an implication for the exchange of signals sequentially government-to-government government dialogue, despite the encroachment of some direct authority and over the final letter (Gatea, 2021).

Diplomacy in the 21st Century

Although modern diplomacy engages in a wide range of activities, it now faces unheard-of influences and limitations. The UN Climate Change Conference in Bonn in 2017 was the world's biggest multilateral meeting ever held in Germany; issues like climate as well as health, which previously history neither implied part of something like the foreign policy realm, are managed by diplomatic means presently as a matter of course. This is just one example of how its diversifying influence is mirrored in the development of the structure and motifs of conventional multilateralism. At about the same time, some aspects of international affairs are moving away from internationalism, and it isn't just US President Donald Trump who believes that bilateral agreements are preferable when it comes to resolving foreign policy issues. Finally, the public is increasingly demanding things of diplomacy, whether it be to cease whaling, block the influx of refugees, or address any other problem on the current agenda, often through the medium of social media (Stanzel, n.d).

In the decades following the conclusion of the Cold War, this type of transformation has either become more apparent or has only recently emerged. Even if solely for its impact just on the politics of contemporary states, the new constraints and expansion in diplomacy need academic investigation.

In line with the general speed of progress in contemporary industrial societies, modern diplomacy is currently undergoing a period of change. But precisely since they deviate from what is conventionally thought of as typically diplomatic, diplomats' reactions to contemporary difficulties sometimes go

unnoticed by governments as well as the general public. However, they do have a significant impact on how governments act and see themselves, as well as, most likely, how the general public views foreign policy (Stanzel, n.d).

The few are more used to participating in, being affected by, or observing modern statesmanship and are aware of its rapid changes. Several recent events have shown that diplomats are currently attempting to navigate the ramifications of these rapid changes. Several reform initiatives—including those in Germany in response to the thorough “Review” analysis carried out in 2014—seek to facilitate information exchange between both the international bodies of EU member states about the use of reform as well as the reforms already in progress. The significance of the upcoming differences like diplomacy is highlighted by the fact that indeed China is grappling with modern diplomacy-related questions (Stanzel, n.d).

These changes in the focus of international intervention raise concerns about which modern diplomatic developments will have longer-term effects, as well as whether and how countries should react to those developments. Four diplomatic factors appear to be of utmost significance:

- The individual’s characteristics as a diplomat;
- Changes that accompany technological advancements, particularly those brought on by digitalization;
- A rise in actors engaged in diplomatic activity;
- The various publics’ newly increased sensitivity to international policies (Stanzel, n.d).

The diplomat’s character and job are affected by the plurality and pluralism of contemporary society just as much as any other individual. An illustration may be what happens when social media is used: even a diplomat’s usage of social media creates a “message” from their culture to the outside world that goes above what a government intends to publicly say. When selecting, educating, and employing diplomats, it is important to consider how this alters the outward look and probably the direction of diplomacy.

Many new players participate in diplomatic procedures according to their own volition and/or are purposefully involved in handling new international tasks. Additional national institutions, including other ministries with responsibilities for international relations, international organizations, mostly UN divisions, or, for Europeans, EU organizations, are some of these actors. They could include non-governmental groups and international corporations. The digital revolution has made diplomats more accessible to the public, but they are also more obscured through other international policy actors as a result. In truth, the actions of conventionally non-diplomatic individuals frequently cast a long shadow over modern diplomacy as a whole, or certainly to some extent (Stanzel, n.d).

Last but not least, new and frequently very passionate social sensitivities constantly emerge, and these also use social media to interact with each other. Whenever the public makes demand of authorities and governments want to comply, the issue of the democratic mandate of this kind of public and their requests immediately arises (Stanzel, n.d).

‘Diplomacy’ during and after the Cold War

The worldwide bipolar system broke down as a result of the conclusion of the Cold War. Not only did the system’s structure crumble, but also the foundations of international systems sped up the process of

globalization. The increase in this tendency was influenced by causes including the growth of international ties on the one extreme and industrial and scientific development on the other. These changes in the world gave attention to ideas and subjects that weren't the main emphasis and to everyone else that appeared to have been developed in the post-Cold War era. The original conceptions of international affairs, such as strength, capability, nation-state, independence, and ties, have also changed as a result of these alterations. Additionally, the idea of "diplomacy" has evolved. It transcended its limited function as a framework for interactions between major countries and regional administrations. It should be mentioned that changes in other industries had an impact on how people thought about diplomacy. Due to the drastic changes in its form and content, diplomacy is the most significant aspect of every nation's foreign affairs (Qawam, 1992).

The idea and practice of diplomacy underwent wonderful changes as a result of the birth and growth of media networks as well as the absorption of the myth of geography. The idea at hand currently has anything to do with controlling ties between states. From the standpoint of the state, diplomacy is the process of advising on, creating, and carrying out the state's international policies. As a result, diplomacy was a weapon used by official officials in their letters and private talks, in the sharing of opinions, lobbying, visits, threats, and many other diverse activities, as well as in the development of relationships on its basis. Even though it is occasionally utilized in wars & armed conflicts, diplomacy is frequently depicted as a strategy for achieving peaceful ends. It can also be used to conduct individual acts of violence, such as applying for a permit to transport commodities via air routes in the course of carrying out air campaigns. One of the changes in modern politics is the blending of the lines between violent deeds and peaceful intentions. The discussion of diplomacy across time generally has significant significance. Oil diplomacy, source communication, and science diplomacy are only a few examples of various types of diplomacy that are to some extent mirrored here. Nevertheless, the concept of diplomacy today is more expensive than the idea of restricted political and tactical variety (Qawam, 1992).

Additionally, since modern diplomacy has a broader definition, it is incorrect to confine this to the official sense as it pertains to the activities of the foreign affairs ministry and its efforts. Investigating this theoretical and objective extension of diplomacy is the goal of this work. Communication in its narrow meaning is referred to as a non-violent political approach to settling international disputes. This interpretation stands in contrast to the military's use of force to achieve objectives. Nevertheless, in its broadest definition, this idea denotes the administration of foreign policies by which all international affairs are carried out in all spheres of politics, economics, culture, commerce, finance, industry, security, and the armed forces. In other words, diplomacy is a means of achieving objectives, gains, and tactics in the international arena as well as a cover for the development of international policy (Qawam, 1992).

Diplomacy for and from Pakistan and Afghanistan during Cold War

During the Cold War, the diplomatic relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan with the Soviet Union and the United States were characterized by a complex web of alliances and rivalries. The strategic location of these countries made them significant players in the power struggle between the two superpowers. The rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union was played out in various arenas around the world, and Pakistan and Afghanistan were no exception. Both countries pursued policies that

aligned them with one or the other power, and their diplomatic efforts were directed towards maximizing their strategic advantages (Asim, 2023).

Pakistan's relationship with the United States during the Cold War was characterized by a strong alliance that was rooted in strategic considerations. The United States saw Pakistan as a bulwark against communism in the region, and provided it with substantial military and economic aid. In return, Pakistan allowed the United States to use its territory as a base for intelligence operations and military activities in neighboring Afghanistan. Pakistan also played a key role in facilitating the negotiations that led to the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan in 1989 (Asim, 2023).

Afghanistan, on the other hand, pursued a policy of non-alignment during the Cold War, seeking to maintain its independence and neutrality in the face of pressure from both the United States and the Soviet Union. The country received aid from both superpowers at different times, but its relations with the United States deteriorated after the Soviet invasion in 1979. The United States supported the Afghan resistance against Soviet forces, but its support was largely covert and limited in scope (Asim, 2023).

The Soviet Union, for its part, had a complicated relationship with both Pakistan and Afghanistan. While it had friendly relations with Afghanistan in the early years of the Cold War, its invasion of the country in 1979 and subsequent occupation strained those relations. Pakistan, on the other hand, was viewed with suspicion by the Soviet Union, which saw it as a close ally of the United States in the region. The Soviet Union sought to counter American influence in the region by supporting left-wing governments in Afghanistan and elsewhere, but its efforts were largely unsuccessful (Asim, 2023).

The United States, for its part, pursued a policy of containment towards the Soviet Union during the Cold War, seeking to limit its influence and expansion around the world. In Afghanistan, this policy took the form of supporting the Afghan resistance against Soviet forces, as well as providing aid to Pakistan. The United States also sought to counter Soviet influence in the region by building relationships with other countries, such as India and Iran (Asim, 2023).

In fact, the diplomacy of Pakistan and Afghanistan towards the Soviet Union and the United States during the Cold War was shaped by the strategic considerations of the two superpowers, as well as the desire of these countries to maximize their own advantages. While Pakistan aligned itself strongly with the United States, Afghanistan pursued a policy of non-alignment. The Soviet Union had a complicated relationship with both countries, seeking to counter American influence in the region. The United States pursued a policy of containment towards the Soviet Union, seeking to limit its expansion and influence around the world. These complex diplomatic relationships had far-reaching consequences for the region and the world, and continue to shape politics in the region to this day (Asim, 2023).

Conclusion

During the Cold War, the diplomacy of Pakistan and Afghanistan towards the Soviet Union and the United States played a significant role in shaping the political landscape of the region. Pakistan, being a strategic ally of the United States, maintained a pro-Western stance and was an active participant in the anti-Soviet alliance. On the other hand, Afghanistan's diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union were cordial, and the country remained a Soviet satellite state until the end of the Cold War (Zaheer & Asim, 2023)

Pakistan's diplomacy towards the United States was based on the shared strategic interests of the two countries. The US relied on Pakistan to serve as a front-line state in its efforts to contain the Soviet Union's expansionist ambitions in the region. As a result, Pakistan received significant military and economic aid from the US, which helped it modernize its armed forces and bolster its economy (Zaheer & Asim, 2023)

Afghanistan's diplomacy towards the Soviet Union, on the other hand, was shaped by the close political and economic ties between the two countries. The Soviet Union provided significant military and economic aid to Afghanistan and helped it modernize its infrastructure and economy. However, the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in 1979 and the subsequent war put a strain on the two countries diplomatic relations (Zaheer & Asim, 2023)

The diplomacy of the Soviet Union and the United States towards Pakistan and Afghanistan during the Cold War was primarily focused on advancing their strategic interests in the region. The Soviet Union sought to expand its influence in Afghanistan and establish a pro-Soviet government there. In contrast, the United States aimed to contain Soviet expansionism in the region and maintain its strategic alliance with Pakistan. Therefore, it has been assessed that the diplomacy of Pakistan and Afghanistan towards the Soviet Union and the United States during the Cold War was shaped by the geopolitical realities of the time. Both countries pursued diplomatic strategies that were aimed at securing their strategic interests and advancing their political and economic agendas. The Cold War may have ended, but the legacy of that era continues to shape the diplomatic relations of these countries with the rest of the world.

References

- Arjamand, M. J. (1392). Influence of Jahani Shadan Farhanak Berjayakah Diplomat Islamic Republic of Iran. *Mutala'at Inqilab Islami*, (34).
- Asim, Dr. Muhammad. (2023). Post-Cold War US Diplomacy towards Afghanistan, Iran and Pakistan. Islamabad. Pak-Iran Intellectuals Forum (Islamabad Office)
- Freeman, C. W. (1998, July 20). Diplomacy | Definition, Meaning, Types, & Examples. Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/diplomacy>
- Gatea, F. (2021), *"Transformation of the Concept of 'Diplomacy' during and after the Cold War"*
- Hocking, Brian, (2005), 'Rethinking the New Public Diplomacy'.
- Khorshidi, M. (1394). The role of modern diplomacy in securing the national interests of the Islamic Republic of Iran. *Politics*, 2(6).
- Metzl, Jamie (2001), Network Diplomacy, *Georgetown Journal Of International Affairs*.
- Melissen, Jan (2005), "The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice".
- Qawam, S. (1392). Connections between people: Theories and practices. Tehran: Samt.
- Sofer, S. (n.d.). Old and new diplomacy: a debate revisited | Review of International Studies. In Cambridge Core. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/review-of-international-studies/article/abs/old-and-new-diplomacy-a-debate-revisited/461A74AAB8C3F9BE75F265A6EA0ADCEE>

Zaheer, Dr. Muhammad Akram & Asim, Dr. Muhammad. (2023). US Diplomacy for Afghanistan and Pakistan. Islamabad. Pak-Iran Intellectuals Forum (Islamabad Office)