**NOTE 5: OLD AND NEW DIPLOMACY**

**5.0. INTRODUCTION**

The history of Diplomacy is divided into two time periods. These time periods have given title to the type of Diplomacy practised then. They are called **Old** and **New Diplomacy**. Scholars differ on what timeline to give to this period. Such arouse because the idea to break Diplomacy into two periods was born out of the establishment of the Westphalian System. For the most part old diplomacy is placed within the period of the **18th, 19th** and early **20th century** (up to 1914). While New Diplomacy covers from 1914 till date. Some scholars as well expand Old Diplomacy coverage to as to include all practice of Diplomacy before New Diplomacy.

**5.1. OLD DIPLOMACY**

For Old Diplomacy it had to do with the traditional form and characteristic of Diplomacy until 1914 when diplomacy transition into New Diplomacy.

**5.2. NATURE OF OLD DIPLOMACY**

Firstly, **Old Diplomacy** had an **Eurocentric Nature.** Here, Diplomacy was mainly a European affair. And so, this nature is made justiciable by the historical distribution of power in Europe. Other continents like Asia, Africa, the Americas, Oceania and Antarctica was dominated, controlled or ruled by the European system. Such European dominance made Diplomacy mostly influence, shaped and determined by European events and tactics until the emergence of newly independent states.

Also, **Old Diplomacy** was **Aristocratic in Nature**. Such meant that diplomats were made up of a professional and elite class characterised by nobles and aristocrat. The monarchs or rulers selected these upperclassmen due to the trust they had in them. They were appointed to represent their monarchs in a formal and elitist manner, and by that, this nature reinforced Diplomacy as the domain of the kings or rulers. Here, Diplomacy was formally conducted by its practitioners who must exhibit virtues as representative of an elitist profession. Such virtue demands the diplomatic corps to abide by rule and regulation of their craft, adhere strictly to protocol and enshrine the dignity and prestige of their nation. This didn’t mean diplomats would not engage in double-dealing, but demanded from them, the telling of honest lies, strict conformity with protocols, total commitment to national interest and strict observation of secrecy.

Another nature of **Old Diplomacy** was the practice of **Secret Diplomacy**. It enshrined the conduct of activities in confidence with little information about diplomatic activities made public. Old Diplomacy saw secrecy in terms of negotiation, and their outcome carried out in secret as an ideal way of relations for the preservation of peace and problem solving as treaties, alliances and compromise can be reached with little publicity.

Likewise, the nature of **Old Diplomacy** entailed **freedom of actions for a Diplomat**. It aroused from the distance between ambassadors and their superiors as well as the slow pace of communication that necessitated Ambassador deriving greater latitude of action in negotiation and other diplomatic activities to respond to situations as they develop.

**5.3. NEW DIPLOMACY**

By the end of the 20th century, the nature of Diplomacy characterised by Old Diplomacy had changed. Such a change came about due to the development of a fast and comprehensive medium or means of transportation and communication. Also, the rise of technology advancement fuelled the shift from Old Diplomacy to New Diplomacy. For the nature of New Diplomacy which aroused from the post-world war era to date we have;

**5.4. NATURE OF NEW DIPLOMACY**

Firstly, Diplomacy was now **Global**. It meant that Diplomacy was not just the domain of Europeans. The newly independent nation joined the European system they transformed it to its international dimension by abandoning Eurocentric nature for a global one.

Secondly, **New Diplomacy** transformed the nature of Diplomacy from **Bilateral** (*between two States*) **to Multilateral** (*between three or more States*). It institutionalised the internationalisation of diplomatic practice via multilateral negotiation, international conference, the institutionalised Diplomacy at the United Nations (UN) and the rise of direct personal contacts amongst statesmen and leaders.

Also, **New Diplomacy** has transformed Diplomacy nature to be **Less Formal**; it has made Diplomacy not to be as rigid as before in respect to the rules and procedure as they exist in informal and direct contacts amongst leaders and Diplomat from different countries.

Likewise, changes in the nature of Diplomacy due to the emergence of **New Diplomacy** is that Diplomacy is more **Open** and **Democratic**. Opened Diplomacy entails the commitment to the democratic rights of citizens to know and participate in foreign policy decision making. It occurs by taking into consideration the wishes of the people via public opinion. Such occur through citizens access to information on negotiations and their outcomes. Citizens ability to follow (Via Social, Digital and Mass Media) their nations diplomatic activities, thereby leads to government accountability. Hence, **Open Diplomacy** also allows for the democratisation of Diplomacy. It does this as it opens up Diplomacy from the dominance of a small, aristocratic and elite class of Diplomat to one that is influenced by public opinion, political parties, pressure group, world opinion and the role of the civil service.