Transformation of the Concept of 'Diplomacy' during and after the Cold War

Assist.Inst Doaa Fadhil Gatea

[1]College of Law – Imam Ja'afar Al-Sadiq University/ Iraq
Doaa.gatea@sadiq.edu.iq

Abstract

In the last decades of the cold war, fall of Polarization, and the increase of globalization in international circles; rules governing the relations of activists have become subject to essential transformations. Due to these transformations, methods of competing for power and achieving benefits and goals differed greatly. In light of the changes that have occurred in the features of the world during the last decades as a result of the wide fluctuations that have caused various currents in the political, economic, social, cultural, scientific, and military fields; international activities in the transformed circles of the world have undoubtedly changed fundamentally and widely from the previous ones. Therefore, states needed to cope with the requirements of modern globalization. Today, countries have become active in the era of international politics and economics which is the Post-Peace Treaty Era (Westphalia) and Post-Power Era. It is inevitable to play the game of power within the framework of modern laws governing the cosmic order.As in other fields, we feel the need to change the angle of view in the diplomatic field. Accordingly, it is necessary to discuss the concept of diplomacy as an entry issue that countries use in achieving their goals, and this is the aim of the current study. This study adopted the analytical descriptive method and the modern diplomacy composed its theoretical framework.

Introduction

The end of the Cold War caused the collapse of the international bipolar system. This collapse was not only in the structuring of the system but also in the fundamentals of the international systems which led to an acceleration of the tide of globalization. The expansion of international relations on the one hand and industrial and technological development on the other were factors affecting the rapid pace of this trend.

These transformations in the world brought attention to concepts and topics that were not the focus of attention and to others that looked as if they had been created in the post-Cold War era. Moreover, these transformations contributed to changes in the original concepts of international relations such as power, capacity, national interests, independence, and relations. 'Diplomacy' has also transformed as a concept. It got out of its narrow sense as a framework of relations between regional governments and great powers.

It should be noted that the shift in the concept of diplomacy was influenced by transformations in other fields. Diplomacy is the most important feature of the foreign policies of every country because it witnessed radical changes in form and content. With the emergence and expansion of media networks and the penetration of the myth of geography, wonderful transformations occurred in the concept and form of diplomacy. The concept now is connected to the relations between states and managing these relations.

From the perspective of the state, diplomacy is in the field of consultation, formation, and implementation of the state's foreign policies. Hence, diplomacy was a tool used by the official representatives of the state in their correspondence and private conversations, in the exchange of views, lobbying, visits, threats and other various activities, and in building relations on its basis. Diplomacy is often presented as an activity linked to peaceful goals, although it is sometimes used in wars and armed conflicts. It may be used to carry out private acts of violence such as obtaining a transit permit for goods through air routes in implementation of air campaigns. This blurring of the boundary between peaceful goals and acts of violence is one of the transformations of modern diplomacy.

In general, the talk about diplomacy over time includes broad implications. On one level, other concepts of diplomacy are reflected such as oil diplomacy, source diplomacy, and science diplomacy. However, diplomacy today has a broader concept than the concept of limited political and strategic diversity. It is also not correct to limit diplomacy to an official meaning within the framework of the work of the ministries of foreign affairs and their initiatives because modern diplomacy has a wider meaning. The aim of this study is to investigate this conceptual and objective expansion of diplomacy. In fact, diplomacy in its limited sense is called a peaceful political style in resolving international conflicts. This meaning is in contrast to the exploitation of the violent military style to obtain results. However, this concept in its broad sense indicates the management of foreign policies through which all foreign affairs are implemented in all political, economic, cultural, commercial, financial, industrial, security, and military fields. In other words, diplomacy is a cover for the implementation of foreign policies and a way to achieve goals, benefits, and strategies in the international environment (Qawam, 1392).

In this study we attempt to answer what the conceptual and operational shifts faced in post-Cold War diplomacy. In order to accommodate this subject in principle, it is necessary to discuss the transformations that have taken place in international relations and the international policies that followed them in general, and then we addressed the various forms of diplomacy in the light of those changes and transformations.

Theoretical Background

Diplomacy is important in helping countries achieve their goals, and the studies conducted in this regard support the validity of this important role. Most of the previous studies have investigated diplomacy in terms of differences between formal and public diplomacy. Mansour Rahmani (1393) discussed in an article entitled '*Public Diplomacy and Foreign Diplomacy*' the shift in the concept of diplomacy following the technological revolution and relations in the era of globalization. He also reviewed the functions of public diplomacy.

Mansour Rahmani believes that public diplomacy can affect government policy and people's ideas and minds through coordination between many areas including directing public opinion, the role of audio-visual and readable media in the international sphere, the impact of migration, the globalization of ideas and thoughts, expanding the role of institutions and international non-governmental organizations, the exchange of cultures, the simple transfer of elites, the involvement of civil society in political matters, and the internationalization and globalization of cultures.

Nejad (1395) considers that information and communication technology, by making use of media and Internet communication networks, has challenged the agenda of classic diplomacy. In addition to the issues of establishing peace and preventing wars, other topics such as terrorist organizations, sectarian extremism, environmental challenges, and information and communication management were placed on the diplomatic agenda.

Bour and Wahidi (1390) tried to answer questions about the reason for introducing modern public diplomacy in international relations, how to present it, and its internal structure and its business record. They believe that the formation of the modern public international environment has changed modern public diplomacy to one of the original elements in the soft or smart power of various countries, and that this transformation in the national diplomatic apparatus has had an impact on actions, dialogues, and images in the entire international environment.

As for the Latin research in this field, it is also possible to refer to Melissen (2012) who discussed immersion diplomacy where change and diplomatic continuity, areas and programs, multiple actors, diplomatic processes, structure, and factors are all combined and integrated to work towards achieving national and international goals and benefits.

Ghosh reviewed diplomacy in the period of Greece, the Romans, the Byzantine, the state-cities of Italy, the Congress of Wayne, the 16th and 17th centuries, the international community, the Cold War, and in the period of modernity. He believes that the concept of diplomacy will keep shifting and changing with the change of international policies because diplomacy is a developing (dynamic) concept.

In the current research, the shift in the concept of diplomacy is divided into two original parts: classical and modern, or traditional and modern. We want to discuss the course of these conceptual transformations in the next section. In principle, some theoretical literature is explained briefly, and then the concept of diplomacy is reviewed.

Theoretical Background

Modern public diplomacy

The joke that must be paid attention to when raising the issue of modern diplomacy is the factor of the information revolution that developed and expanded within the framework of the globalization trend in the post-Cold War period. Although diplomacy has turned into a pattern of well-known policies among diplomats, but modern public diplomacy is a modern phenomenon that has spread and thrived in light of the information and communication technology revolutions. It is the product of stressing and focusing on old activities. The difference between them is that modern public diplomacy talks about a change in the approach taken from distributing information among the addressees abroad to the trend towards direct communication with them (Mellisen, 2005: p.13-14).

This happened as a result of the change in international environmental conditions. To begin with, we are witnessing the emergence of a postmodern government that is merely part of the multi-layered relations with other actors, although it must be ready to respond to the effects that occur. These effects were accompanied by the emergence of the global public sphere in which the international public university tries to confront some common problems such as the environment, human rights, and social justice in the international sphere, which in turn depends on the developments in the technology of connections, loads, and transportation.

The delivery of messages unilaterally by governments in the case of turning into a losing strategy in the world of networks stresses the traditional structure of diplomacy to imprint itself with a non-hierarchical system (Khorshidi, 1394: p.75). This new system is centered on the inclusion of all collective endeavors and strategies. It does not consider foreign citizens as targets, but rather as activists with influence.

The most important difference between traditional public diplomacy and modern public diplomacy is the communicative approach used in them. In other means, the traditional diplomacy system is a hierarchical system centered around a block, while the modern public diplomacy system is centered around the network.

The type of hierarchical system that was expanded during the Cold War period by the United States of America is conceptually close to the propaganda system, and follows the policy of strategic public diplomacy for the transmission of information from the upper layers to the lower layers of the target groups (Hocking, 2005: p.36-37). Thus, traditional public diplomacy is based on two-stage methods. By influencing the collective mind abroad, which in turn influences the foreign policies of countries, it is able to achieve its goal. Accordingly, this type of diplomacy protects that type of engagement that works to induce carrots by transmitting information arranged in an offensive manner. However, this pattern gives satisfactory results for governments (Metzl, 2001: 2).

On the other hand, the network pattern is a reaction to the changes taking place in the international field which is characterized by cultural diversity, the emergence of activists, and the creation of interactive media. This pattern is also characterized by decentralization. Accordingly, the need to create and shape values and standards and not to grant absolute power to any party are emphasized.

In the context of confronting common cross-border problems, this pattern works to form relationships around mutual benefits with the aim of encouraging action in areas in which governments alone cannot play an active role. This pattern, of course, builds on scattered membership and non-hierarchical organizations to accommodate new activists and the effective employment of specialized sciences. Therefore, network diplomacy requires changes in the engagement strategy and the liberalization of the communicative approach which is centered on the bloc based on employing the spread of international news to transmit selected messages to a wide spectrum of stable and immobile interlocutors to achieve political goals. On the other hand, modern public diplomacy emphasizes the networking approach that builds on the formation of strong relations with foreign citizens as a goal in itself and as a means for the transmission of messages sequentially and bilateral dialogue, regardless of the imposition of control over the final message to some extent.

The Transformation of the Concepts of International Politics after the Cold War

Our temporal scale for reviewing the concept of diplomacy is divided into the pre- and post-Cold War periods. Therefore, it is necessary to study the differences in most of the issues regarding sovereignty, the structure of the international system, the nature of information and connections, the role and meaning of power, issues of perceptual beauty, etc. as follows:

Post-cold war era	Cold War and pre-cold war era	
Boundaries are penetrable. Expansion of international law on transit and passage of border crossings. The capabilities of internal representatives in the field of foreign policy are on the rise daily. Regardless of the geographical separations, all countries are neighbors with each other. Globalization has become a cause for the expansion of relations, but in various fields the necessary tools to manage this issue were not available. connections and information technology is a factor influencing foreign policies.	Absolute sovereignty is exercised mainly in the territory of states. The land of each state is under its absolute control. The administrative and executive system of governments is hierarchical. Geographical borders are closed and control is imposed. There was no response or acceptance of responsibility towards public opinion.	Sovereignty and land
The information is very complex and analytical. The accessibility and control of public opinion is very remarkable. It has a virtual essence, multiple visual media coupled with modern technologies, coupled with science and its own analytical approach. The speed of transmission is one of the factors affecting the evaluation of	It was very simple and superficial. It had a very limited analytical nature. It was considered top secret and public access did not exist. Mostly the information was written, sometimes it was oral. The comma and the distance between spaces had a significant impact on the transmission of information.	Essence of information

information at the present time		
The absolute power of the state became questionable. Non-governmental actors expanded into extensive networks. Public opinion has a noticeable influence in the formation and implementation of curricula in the Authority. Absolute achievements are emphasized by soft and hard power. The main orientation in international relations is the politics of power and soft power. The nature of the system is still chaotic. Minimal politics (emphasis on culture and economics rather than military power) gained importance again.	The state is the greatest influence in the field of international relations and has absolute power. The realistic approach and practical policies is the trend often followed in international relations. The politics of force, deterrence and the struggle for survival form the basis of foreign relations. Public opinion has very limited influence on decision-making in the State Department. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is solely responsible for foreign policy.	Essence of the international system
The diplomat's point of view has become influential in the political decision-making processes, while he was previously just an executor of orders. The diplomat has networked with professional and university investigators. They are specialists in their field of work and the tasks assigned to them. Diplomacy has been transformed into groups of specialized and long-	They are from the aristocracy and important classes in society. They have prestige and abuse high-ranking people. Their interests are only defined by a geographical map. Their bilateral relations are of high interest. Diplomacy is largely associated with senior officials (budzman, 2003: 60)	Diplomats

experienced individuals and individuals specialized in certain fields. (Thomson, 2006: 109)

However, we must not exaggerate here about underestimating the role of governments and the essential change in circumstances and concepts. Rather, the parallel relationship between the two facts can be observed simultaneously in the international field. On the one hand, many of the rules and methods established in the peace treaty systems, comparable to the central role of governments in the post-peace treaty period, still have an effective presence and have not been affected by the disappearance or the reversal of identity. For example, diplomacy is still considered one of the activities that governments supervise and take care of as a tool to achieve goals and secure the national interests of governments. Fateful diplomatic meetings between countries are still attended by statesmen. On the other hand, the radical transformations in the world in recent decades have made changing administrative methods and models a necessity. One of them is that governments today cannot overlook the role of activists as individuals and groups and the extent of their influence on political decisions at all.

As a result, governments are obliged to choose their course of action according to the requirements of the new circumstance. Therefore, the interest of governments in modern diplomacy is an answer to the requirements of the new situation (Bour & Wahidi, 1390: p.81).

The transformation of diplomacy in light of the shifts in international politics

The word 'diplomacy' is one of the terms that denote different meanings in the various fields of political science and international relations, and it has been defined from multiple dimensions.

Bosch and Tutonjian (1372) present forty-six definitions of the word 'diplomacy' including 'foreign policy', 'political negotiations', 'the apparatus of managing foreign affairs', 'politics', 'the art of relations with other countries', etc. They believe that each of these definitions speaks of the merits of diplomacy, but they present the following definition from the culture of international relations: "Directing interstate relations through government representatives." (p.406).

Diplomacy is one of the bayonets that countries use in their foreign policies. They defined diplomacy as the art of managing foreign policies or regulating international relations and resolving and settling international disputes by peaceful means.

Diplomacy in its traditional form was hidden and limited, but over time it became public and open. Changes in the international system and the evolution of the role of non-governmental representatives and public opinion have caused new forms of diplomacy to be taken advantage of alongside traditional diplomacy (Structure, 1392). In a broader sense, diplomacy refers to directing human affairs through peaceful methods and techniques of persuasion and negotiation.

Diplomacy is defined as an institution defining independent governmental systems which often denotes the post-1648 peace treaty (Westival) system. Moreover, some differences can be noted

between the definitions of the concept of diplomacy. For example, at the international level, diplomacy is used as a synonym for foreign policy such as Russian, German, and Japanese diplomacy (especially in the readings of the history of diplomacy) if they may be referred to as the tool through which such policies are implemented.

Second, under the title 'The Institution of the International System', it is possible to distinguish between diplomacy as a set of approaches and treatments and diplomacy as a structure that is formed through those approaches and treatments. The continued use of diplomacy in contemporary international politics has often confused these meanings (Donna and Hocking, 2011: p.2). In other words, there are two different understandings of diplomacy: the first is that diplomacy is a process of dealing with relationships, and the second that diplomacy is an art.

Brian White believes that this disparity can be properly understood if diplomacy is observed fully and partially, and then its definition can be properly addressed. In the holistic view (international politics view), diplomacy is the process of relations between international activists to resolve and separate international disputes and conflicts through discussions and negotiations to prevent war.

In this view, diplomacy refers to cooperation between governments that aim to manage and stabilize the system in the international system and prevent the transformation of disputes into wars. In terms of the partial view (the view of foreign policies), diplomacy is defined as a tool for military force, and it is used in the context of achieving the foreign policy goals of international activists (Saidi, 1396: p.113).

The study of diplomacy follows a long tradition goes back to Machiavellian thinking. It was only in recent years that accurate readings pursued the importance of diplomacy in many theoretical and practical fields.

The loss of conscious theories is clearly seen in many investigations about diplomacy, but on the other hand, a large part of the research reviews accurate historical reports on diplomatic events (the history of diplomacy) and thus they review many texts in this field.

Research on diplomacy among diplomatic investigators is implicitly utilized within the analytical framework of a realist tradition in international relations. The results in an orthodox study of diplomacy and with a completely different theoretical approach - the rarest of which is in political science - there is an amazing existential compatibility between the resource of diplomacy and diplomats. This compatibility came as a result of the dominance and predominance of logical thinking. As a result of this control, the scope of research in most diplomatic research in the international field is determined by the ruling countries in the field of high politics. There is no enthusiasm and passion for mainstream investigators to explore the diplomatic world including international relations, minimal politics, or even non-political realms. This is at a time when diplomacy was not limited to a tool for the foreign policy of states, but was known as a means of communicating cultures, politics, economy, and societies. These investigations have been explained in the form of the types of diplomacy and the changes and transformations taking place in it.

Traditional Diplomacy

Diplomacy in its traditional sense includes the dealings that take place between governments and

states. Implementers of traditional diplomacy seek by creating the link between the official representatives of foreign countries to achieve national interests that come within the framework of the strategic goals of the state they follow in international matters, and they seek to secure those interests. McCullin, the general diplomatic advisor to the US State Department, sees traditional diplomacy as (state-to-state diplomacy). Traditional diplomacy centers on the efforts of government officials to influence government officials in the other country to take special positions (Khawani, 1386: p.108).

Concerning the objectives that countries are looking for in the field of diplomacy, economic and military issues represent economic or military diplomacy. Economic diplomacy refers to the meeting point between diplomacy and national and international economic activities. Moreover, it is the common separation between the national economic benefits and all the political, security and cultural benefits of each country at the level of the international system of the international political economy. Therefore, the subject of economic diplomacy from the point of view of modern liberalism in the post-Cold War period and with the expansion of globalization processes has been placed in front of traditional diplomacy as one of the modern and powerful tools in the international space to complement and redress the shortage and meet the new needs of countries in the field of international economy.

In a more comprehensive definition, economic diplomacy can be defined as the completeness of strategic activities, coordinated initiatives, and economic and political consensus in the national and international spheres that can be used in the foreign policies of states in the national and international sphere of international economy (Salihi, 1392: p.415).

A government that uses military freedom in its foreign policies seeks through pressure on the requested country to force it to seriously review the behavioral pattern of its foreign policy in terms of the hierarchy of national goals and interests as well as statements of foreign policy positions.

Using military freedom does not mean achieving a series of military strategic goals. Governments may use the military card in order to regain their lost prestige or to meet cultural, economic, and political demands (Qawam, 1388).

Although globalization took place in the decade (1960) and in the post-Cold War era filled with tension, however, cultural issues were not welcome because it was the heads of the two poles, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which set the nature of the relationships between the components of the international system.

After the end of the Cold War and the huge transformations that followed in the field of industry and technology, cultural issues and the analysis of politics and international relations from a semantic and cultural perspective became of great importance to governments and opinion-holders in international issues.

In search of highlighting cultural issues in the era of globalization and with the expansion of communication technology, governments tended to take advantage of this tool in order to advance national goals and interests. Today we are witnessing the emergence and formation of cultural committees and unions in the global field through which the causes of international disputes and challenges rise to be a cause of rapprochement between governments and their peoples. Hence, gaining prestige and international prestige and influencing public opinion, or in other words mastery of soft

power, are among the important and authorized objectives of state diplomacy in the field of international politics. Moreover, this follows the location, status, capabilities, opportunities, and cultural capabilities of each country in different ways and mechanisms. Hence, governments seek to consolidate their knowledge and cultural structure, spread values and sciences, and export visions outside their geographical borders in order to be able to be one of the tools of power in addition to political power. With the use of the technique of cultural persuasion instead of the application of force, it works to bias world public opinion for its goals and interests (Arjomand, 1392: p.163-164).

Public Diplomacy

Types of diplomacy differ according to the conceptual shift over time. Some use the broad term of public diplomacy in contrast to traditional diplomacy, and this is what we will refer to later. Activities related to types of public diplomacy led to the emergence of different sections of each type according to the nature of the activity. The three sections of diplomacy are: cultural diplomacy, media diplomacy, and exchange diplomacy.

Cultural diplomacy

Cultural diplomacy is a process through which governments try to influence public opinion and the behavior of other countries by using abilities, talents and cultural characteristics. In fact, cultural diplomacy is a tool used by governments to create attractions in the public opinion of other countries and thus influence their behavior and policies.

Media or digital diplomacy

Governments also benefit from media diplomacy as a tool to influence the formation of ideas and opinions of peoples in other countries towards events and transformations. Furthermore, media enables governments express its views and viewpoints and presenting them in the international scene.

Media activities in the form of media diplomacy seek to guide public opinion and excuse justifications for decisions taken in the field of foreign policies. In fact, the goal of political diplomacy is to create a positive and desirable image of government goals and policies in front of public opinion.

Digital diplomacy (technical) is in fact a kind of virtual diplomacy, cyber diplomacy, electronic diplomacy, and network diplomacy. In other words, it is global diplomacy.

Digital diplomacy has its own characteristics which include high accessibility by public opinion because it is networked and flexible, efficient and transient, has low cost, multi-dimensional, centered on advanced technology, responsive, responsible, and science-based. The tools of digital diplomacy include websites of foreign ministries and diplomats, data banks and advanced software, the Internet, virtual embassies, network and virtual relationships for diplomats from different countries. Today, diplomacy is not only concerned with expanding national interests in the real field but also includes managing the digital field (Kohari Moghadam, 1387: p.113-115).

Exchange diplomacy

Exchange diplomacy is concerned with reaching long term goals. It is a set of cross-border activities and procedures that seek to transfer the culture of values and beliefs to other nations. The field of

exchange diplomacy, albeit broad, often includes university activities. Exchanging professors, giving scholarships to students, offering opportunities for reading and investigations, holding scientific tours and educational workshops are among the activities offered in the form of exchange diplomacy. In fact, this type of diplomacy is one of the important methods for establishing relations with the elites of other countries. However, it must be noted that all activities in the three cultural, media, and exchange fields are not considered part of public diplomacy.

Defining these categories of activities is related to giving an accurate definition of the concept of public diplomacy and clarifying the differences between this concept and other concepts, and this is what we discuss in the following section of the study (Rahmani, 1393: 70-71).

Finally, some add to official diplomacy and public diplomacy a third form described as 'diplomacy of the second track'.

Diplomacy of the second track

Diplomacy of the second track is one of the finest and most developed types of diplomacy at the same time. It is the least known of the modern types of diplomacy. It acts as the mediation between the parties to international disputes by any non-governmental agent or international institutions. Usually, this agent is from a non-governmental organization. The diplomacy of the second track can be pursued independently or with the participation of a government or a group such as the United Nations institutions. In other means, the diplomacy of the second track is a type of diplomacy in which the factors are non-governmental parties, and it mostly includes areas, topics, and fields that were previously handled by governments.

The basis of the second track diplomacy is based on the interference of non-governmental persons such as university professors, statesmen, retired military, public figures and social activists in interstate conflicts to establish dialogue in order to gain confidence and solve outstanding problems (Si'edi, 1396: p.121-122). In this kind of diplomacy, workers take the initiative to know the roots of crises through reflection, research, and dialogue; and they usually offer solutions that satisfy both sides. The real or virtual parties to the conflict are diagnosed and satisfactory solutions are presented to the conflict parties. This type of diplomacy follows the relational rationality of Jürgen Habermas, which aims to give the role of civil society and people in diplomatic processes and to create understanding by establishing dialogues. On the other hand, formal diplomacy is dry and ideological; and meetings and engagement between the two sides of the discussion and finding satisfactory solutions for both parties may sometimes reach a dead end (Amidi, 1395: p.2).

Goals of Modern Diplomacy

Influencing International Public Opinion and Citizens

The goal of modern diplomacy has changed to achieving citizen satisfaction and acquiring the basic rule in the foreign policies of countries due to the revolutions taking place in the form and structuring of political societies and the change and transformation from an authoritarian society to a democratic system with constitutional institutions. Therefore, nowadays every country intends to establish relations with another country. If a state wants to draw the attention of a country with respect to a particular subject in general, it feels the need in principle to make the opinions and ideas of the citizens

of that country harmonious and compatible with it through media and public diplomacy.

Globalization, especially in the field of connections, helps in this context by delivering the messages quickly and in the shortest possible time to citizens of the target community by making use of modern communication tools. Because cultural statements and topics do not fall within the category of serious and strategic policies and often operate in a light and soft manner, the acceptance of them by international public opinion may be easier than other statements.

Showing the Best Side of the World and Gradually Remove Misunderstandings

This is the axis and the central core in the analysis of the constructivist theorists in international relations shaped by the mentality of governments and the original workers in the international system. The constructivist theory is one of the explanatory theories in international relations which stayed in the human mind and did not give it legitimacy, but rather connects everything with human actions and behaviors.

The core of the constructivist approach can be clearly seen in Knett's statement: "Anarchy and anarchism are something created by governments. However, this does not mean that in the constructivist theory attention is given only to the agents of governments, but the same structure has the importance of agents and governments or may exceed them in importance. Since it is an immaterial and normative skeletal product of the thinking and position of agents and governments; and because when compared with other structures such as the economic and military, they are more flexible; So this structure will change easily once the mentality of the agents changes. For example, the soft war broke out between America and the Soviet Union when each of the two countries considered the other a rival. The war did not stop until these two great powers stopped presenting the other as their enemy." (Qawam, 1392: p.326).

The perception imprinted in the minds of others of a country is as important as the reality of that country. Countries understand each other on the basis of perceptions taken from each other, and on this basis they also take political decisions towards each other. Therefore, one of the most important tasks of a skilled and faithful diplomat is to present the ideal and desirable aspect of his government, and to make it known as a peaceful country affiliated with international rules and rights. From the writers' point of view, cultural diplomacy, with its supposed peculiarities, can play this role. The globalization of connections can play a helpful role for those working in the field of foreign policy and diplomacy. In fact, cultural diplomacy plays a major role in highlighting the peaceful and positive face of a government, state, or people (Guibari & Hamkaran: p.1396).

Creating Conditions for Mutual Understanding and Cooperation in the International Field

Another main objective of public and modern diplomacy is to create the conditions in which peoples are able to learn each other's culture and values so that the way will open up to establishing broad relations at the international level. Cooperation in international fields depends on the mutual understanding of countries with each other. If states and international representatives do not have knowledge of each other, they will not show the desire to cooperate and deal with each other.

Cultural diplomacy in the world of globalization today is the only tool that countries can benefit from in the field of foreign policy with the aim of introducing and familiarizing themselves with norms,

values, and knowledge of the identity of the counterpart in an adequate and satisfactory manner.

In general, holding conferences, symposia, artistic and cultural festivals, and highlighting historical and cultural commonalities help in gaining peoples' reciprocal knowledge and understanding about each other significantly, and prepares them to enter into a cooperative process and constructive interactions in international fields (Shahram Nia & Nazifi , 1392: p.148).

Gaining International Consideration and Standing

Gaining international prestige is one of the main objectives of all countries in the field of foreign policies. Countries are doing everything they can to gain the closest position with all other countries. In the past, the encroachment on the territory of another country and its occupation brought prestige to the aggressor, but now it brings shame and disgrace to that country in the minds and international public opinion, especially in today's world where globalization brings any action or reaction as quickly as possible to all parts of the world.

However, cultural activities and reliance on cultural tools that indicate the desire of countries to advance their national goals and interests by peaceful means are things that are accepted by international public opinion and are considered legitimate.

Reducing Escalation and Resolving Disputes Peacefully

Cultural diplomacy plays a very important role in creating relations between countries in contemporary international relations. It can serve in the period of the occurrence of the political problem because culture, even in difficult times and crises, can keep the doors of international relations open. Furthermore, there are many resources that have created a healthy atmosphere for cultural diplomacy to establish relations or to facilitate their establishment in difficult times when things have become very complicated. On the other hand, in times of tension, and when official diplomatic negotiations fail, culture keeps the doors open, hoping that relations will improve.

From McLohan's view, the expansion of associative technologies led to the formation of the world's shape, where everyone was affected by global transformations at the same time, watching and perceiving them.

In our compressed world, time and space have lost their original meaning and are no longer able to play their role, as in the past, in preventing the occurrence of new phenomena such as the globalization of relations in international transformations. Based on this analytical model, foreign policy has not been spared from these influences. In the field of diplomacy and foreign policy, and under the influence of the globalization of connections, countries have used tools that are more in harmony with the era in which we live.

In the past, countries preferred to use hard and coercive methods in order to achieve their goals and interests in international fields. However, with the influence of the globalization of cultures and connections and the shedding of light on intellectual and structural arguments in relations between countries, countries were also convinced to benefit from soft and morally oriented tools in order to implement their foreign plans.

In general, countries, in relation to the external environment, seek a number of main goals which are

gaining benefits, achieving security and raising the level of their national security, gaining national status and prestige, and developing the role in influencing the international atmosphere. Therefore, if governments conclude that through culture or through the soft path in general, they will achieve their goals and achieve their programs, the soft tools will definitely prevail.

It is believed that, given the transformations taking place in the fields of connections and technology, countries show more desire to take advantage of these tools in order to implement their plans in relation to the external environment (Guibari & Hamkaran: p.1396).

Conclusion

Finding shifts in diplomacy is still related to shifts and changes in international structures. As a result of the changes in the international atmosphere, the nature of diplomacy also changed in terms of form and content to have a consistent performance and keep pace with the transformations. Some of the elements which quickened it are the collapse of the bipolar system that used to confine states to narrow meanings of government, power, capacity, and connections. Globalization, with its transformation into technology and its spread of information in an unprecedented time and size, has caused countries to seek to achieve their goals through different means. This issue has added to diplomacy an aesthetic dimension which can be seen in the obsession that governments live with regarding issues beyond their national borders. For example, issues related to human rights, the environment, and soft and sometimes global issues were put on the diplomats' to-do list so that they would be able to convince the public opinion as much as possible.

In general, diplomacy was in the period of the Cold War between governments; but in the period of globalization, diplomacy became between peoples and societies because the public opinion became sensitive to the policies taken by governments.

Bibliography
1. Ashna, H.; Jafari, N.; and Waseef, R. (1386). Public diplomacy and foreign policy, beyond and goals. Danish Siasi.
2. Arjamand, M. J. (1392). Influence of Jahani Shadan Farhanak Bar Jayakah Diplomat Islamic Republic of Iran. Mutala'at Inqilab Islami, (34).
3. Rahmani, M. (1393). Public diplomacy and foreign policy. Mutala'at Jamia'at Shanasi, 10 (35).
4. Najad, A. (1395). Engraving of the connections of Noin and Fanawy Etla'a der the transformation of a diplomatic concept. Majlis W Rahbard, 23 (88).
5. Bour, K. S. and Haidari, M. (1388). New Public Diplomacy: Conceptual and Operational Assignments. Law and political science, 41 (4).
6. Sai'edi, R. and Rabee'. (1396). The emergence of new diplomacy in the changing context of the world system. Studies of state relations, 10 (37).
7. Nia, S. and Nazifi. (1392). The Impact of Globalization on Cultural Diplomacy with Confirmation of Peacebuilding Theory. Culture strategy, (24).
8. Qawam, S. (1392). Connections between people: Theories and practices. Tehran: Samt.
9. Muqadam, A. (1378). Digital Diplomacy: Conceptual and practical transformation. Strategy, (13).
10. Sulaimani, F. (translator). (1396). Anarchist society, a study of order in world politics. Tehran: Mukhatab.
11. Khorshidi, M. (1394). The role of modern diplomacy in securing the national interests of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Politics, 2(6).
12. Omidi, A. (1395). Borjam for Line Two Diplomacy, Iranian Diplomacy.

1. Ghosh, K. (2014), *The Evolution of Diplomacy :from classical to modern*.
2. Thomson,Fred , (2006),|nternationa| Relations In The Changing World , Foreign Policy, July.
3. Budzman, John (2003) , Continuity And Change in International Relations Concepts.
4. Melissen, Jan (2005), "The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice" , in The New Public Diplomacy , edited by Jan Melissen , 3-27. New York: Palgrave.
5. Hocking ,Brian, (2005), /'Rethinking the New Public Diplomacy , In The New Public Diplomacy , edited by Jan Melissen , 28—43. New York :Palgrave.
6. Metzl, Jamie (2001) ,Network Diplomacy , Georgetown Journal Of International Affairs, Available at :
7. http:// carnegieendowment.org/ZOOl/O4/Ol/ Network-diplomacy.
8. Lee, Donna and Hocking, Brian (2011) Diplomacy. In: Badie, Bertrand and Berk-ScholosserDirk and Morlino, Leonardo, eds. The International Encyclopaedia of Political Science.