

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW
MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 5 | Issue 5

2022

© 2022 *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlmh.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/>)

This article is brought to you for “free” and “open access” by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact Gyan@vidhiaagaz.com.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to submission@ijlmh.com.

Refined Diplomacy for the Global Order Restoration; Lessons from the Russia- Ukraine War

MARY GRACE WEDEL¹

ABSTRACT

Diplomacy in the 21st-century is experiencing radical and unprecedented changes that necessitate a fundamental reorientation and refinement. Besides the Russo-Ukrainian war, the world continues to experience limitless threats and tensions that could arise due to territorial disputes, civil wars, and terrorism. Increasing technological power, populist parties, movements, and power competition have threatened diplomacy. There are huge concerns if existing diplomatic encounters will be able to sustain the global order today and in the future.

The conflict between Russia and Ukraine has reignited arguments about diplomacy's strengths and weaknesses, as well as the necessity to close gaps in order to protect future generations from the calamities of war. In the case of Russia and Ukraine, a decade of sanctions, threats, isolation, and negotiations has failed to mediate or remedy the situation, raising new questions about the value of diplomacy. Significant gaps exist in current diplomatic practice, which has created a need for more complex solutions that can accommodate evolving geopolitical policies and help attain a new global order. While it is true that diplomacy cannot be completely eliminated, this article proposes the concept of "refined diplomacy," which focuses on filling in the gaps in current diplomatic approaches in order to secure long-term peace and sovereignty for all nations. The Russo-Ukraine war needs to be the last war and a bridge to unite the West with the rest of the world. Global communities must also link to reform diplomacy to work more effectively and efficiently.

Keywords: War, failed diplomacy, refined diplomacy, new-world order, reforms, peace.

I. INTRODUCTION

The world has dramatically changed since the end of the cold war. Newer and more complex governance systems have replaced the bipolar era and welcomed the new wave of democratization and globalization. In contrast to the Second World War, a revolutionary change has created a more comprehensive shift from traditional diplomacy and rendered the conventional means of deterring conflict incapable of serving the intended purpose. The

¹ Author is a Phd student at Lyceum of The Philippines University, Philippines.

outstanding economic progress in nations such as China, rapidly evolving international and geopolitical policies, and the quest for redistribution of power from the West to the East have led to increased global instability (Huasheng, 2004). The international community is witnessing unpredictable violence and territorial conflicts that diplomatic means and interventions have failed to address, demanding more complex interventions to attain peace and sustainability.

Diplomatic initiatives and interventions have gained immense significance and prevalence since the end of the Cold War in 1991. Nations invested and collaborated through treaties and intergovernmental institutions to create a more robust international order and improve cooperation between states for international peace. Past failures in diplomacy led to war, and the global community has had the challenge of strengthening consensus and balancing power between significant economies. Cahill (2013) stated that preventive diplomacy gained much recognition after the Second World War, and governments failed to adopt diplomatic conditions, causing never-ending negotiations and reciprocal concessions between states. States and international coalitions incorporated coercive diplomacy and defensive alliances to build and achieve power balance and collaboratively invoked sanctions to foster peace and mitigate potential violence from rogue and autocratic nations. With time, the international community established more sensitive policies to balance nuclear power, which was viewed as a potential jeopardy for coercive diplomacy. The increasing threats and proliferation of war signify a need to establish vivid diplomatic mechanisms and reforms that contribute to the core aspects of diplomacy: global representation, communication, and negotiations (Bjola & Kornprobst, 2018). It is already evident that international policy has evolved, and the current conflicts have shifted the role of diplomacy from mitigative to preventive. A war has already been initiated, which calls for immediate diplomatic reform. Diplomacy, like nations, cannot be abolished. As a result, the answer fills in the gaps and leads to a more sophisticated diplomatic strategy for long-term global order and peace. This article evaluates why diplomacy has failed to establish a more sustainable solution to restore international peace and order.

II. THE MEANING AND PURPOSE OF DIPLOMACY

(A) Overview

The term "diplomacy" has existed since the dawn of civilization. It has marked the historical foundation of diplomacy among the global nations in the Vienna Convention of diplomatic relations in 1961. This convention established principles and outlined the rules that formed the current foreign relations code of conduct. Over the years, nations have adjusted and improved their relations, thus enabling progress and achieving sustainable economic, social, and

environmental goals. The ideas of public responsibility, self-determination, and collective security among states have evolved as a new term in diplomacy as a result of the lessons of World War II. Public accountability is one of the core principles of diplomacy that permits countries to respect the sovereignty and democratic rights of the governed (Bjola & Kornprobst, 2018). Self-determination establishes states' equality and independence within their sovereign authority, and collective security finds regulation for a balance of power politics through mutual trust, cooperation, and humanitarian intervention. Diplomacy is vital in maintaining global peace and order through negotiations, mediation, talks, and policy formulations.

(B) Diplomacy in war

Diplomacy can be used to establish new alliances and build coalitions between nations that aim to maintain the balance of power. Swistek (2012) demonstrated an association between diplomacy and military force, arguing that both diplomacy and military force are ways for nations to enforce their agendas on one another. Diplomacy communicates realities, and through actions, states can communicate or sweep away resistance. Diplomacy, however, can be unethical to extremes, resulting in disputes and so contradicting the desired goal of peacemaking by causing horrible wars.

As conventionally equated to the negotiation process to resolve conflict, Smelser and Baltes (2001) view diplomacy as an alternative to war and war as a failure of diplomacy. The most non-violent bargaining process has evolved from a system of maneuvering through the monarchists, public diplomacy, democracy, and the international realm. It focuses on international relations in general, with the goal of promoting peaceful relations. In his book, "The Pure Concept of Diplomacy," De Magalhaes defines diplomacy as conducting negotiations between persons or states to upkeep international affairs and global order. To the author, the term "diplomacy" is a term whose roots exist in the hidden history of humankind (De Magalhaes, 1988). Diplomacy is sometimes viewed as a synonym for foreign policy. Nonetheless, existing literature claims that it has undergone vicissitudes and changes, enabling it to gain greater significance and distinguish itself from the concept of foreign policy.

Diplomacy is a broad topic that may be broken down into several areas and sectors of international relations: digital diplomacy, crisis diplomacy, nuclear diplomacy, and public and cultural diplomacy. However, this article focuses more on the diplomatic aspects of conflict resolution and war prevention. There is a correlation between diplomacy and war. The military theorist Carl von Clausewitz (1804–1871) linked war to diplomacy and argued that it was a means to continue the initiation of policy reforms (Diplomacy, 2017). The main actors in

diplomacy are the states. Thus, as applicable to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961), there must be cooperation, unity, and willingness if the global community is to achieve peace and economic progress.

Nicolson argues that diplomacy is an essential element in any good relationship between men and nations. Since the beginning of civilization, it has been in existence and has either meddled with or shaped new relationships between parties and countries (Nicolson, 2001). Researchers argue that diplomacy elements are hugely entwined with foreign policy, and the term has often been befuddled with components and practices of foreign policy. Contrary to diplomacy, foreign policy consists of self-interest strategies that an individual state chooses to pursue its international interests when interacting with other conditions (Walsh, 2006). Since the founding of the United Nations, diplomacy has helped in the resolution of wars throughout history, but it has also failed to address crucial concerns in the modern world.

Diplomacy has two main functions. First, it is applied to deter war and violence when needed to achieve peaceful relations between countries; foster relations between nations through trade negotiations; discuss mutual problems; reform and implement policies; and tackle disputes. The role of diplomacy goes beyond the peace agenda, focusing beyond protecting the planet on newer solutions for addressing pressing issues and problems (S. Brown, 1994). Brown also views the diplomatic process to attain peace and channel equality. He emphasized that conflict and violence arise when those who feel unfairly deprived are repeatedly turned down and rejected when they make peace demands. Diplomacy is the only strategic approach to attaining a peace plan as it creates willingness and supportive political systems in which such groups or states can air their grievances for mediation, negotiation, or collective assistance (S. Brown, 1994). Without diplomacy, much of international affairs would be abolished, and the world we live in would be in a constant state of war. Current and future generations would be denied the right to peace and harmonious existence in their respective states. Crossman further suggests that conflict is a universal condition older than diplomacy (Crossman, 2014). 21st-century diplomacy has evolved, so the global community should reform policies to shape the international community's ideology into more equality and responsibility.

Since the end of the cold war, the international agenda has significantly changed, and diplomacy has become more global and influential in international policy agendas and peacekeeping. Diplomacy was viewed as a preventive tool for wars and conflicts. This was evident in the prevention diplomacy role undertaken by NATO, the EU, and the United States to prevent war in Macedonia back in 2001 (Ritchie & Egeland, 2018). The success laid a new foundation for global peace, as institutions worldwide sought to pursue personal and institutional teamwork;

early engagement and intervention to prevent violence; and the establishment of more agencies to push the international peace agenda. Scottsmith (2018) explains in his article that when diplomacy fails in its duty of conflict avoidance, the diplomat's role shifts. The Russian-Ukraine war has already demonstrated the failure of diplomatic responsibilities, and failing reforms could aggravate the uprising between Western and Eastern governments.

One of the significant recognized means for conflict prevention is preventive diplomacy and preventive disarmament, which aim to prevent disputes from escalating into conflicts and limit the spread of conflicts when they do occur (Braithwaite, 2019). The conflict between Russia and Ukraine amply demonstrates the need to overcome gaps in diplomatic efforts and policies in order to achieve a permanent global order characterized by peace and concerted efforts to address global challenges.

(C) International Diplomacy and foreign policy

At the international level, diplomacy is defined instead as the conduct of international relations rather than an act. The Vienna Convention of 1961 ushered in a new era of international organizations and diplomacy (Brown, 2015). Diplomacy by intergovernmental organizations has created a new legal environment that can be used to pursue change and influence continuity, change, and standards of appropriate behavior. According to the rational choice theory, states are viewed as the key actors in the geopolitical scope whose goals entail seeking power, health, and security.

Diplomacy operates within the frameworks of communities and is submerged within sovereign nation-states. They focus on a broader aspect of solving global problems. Thus, institutions and multilateral organizations have been established to mediate societies' general discourse over history. While most foreign policies have emerged successful in promoting worldwide sustainability and economic success, there have been constant diplomatic failures when states decide to invoke severe economic and diplomatic sanctions on other states without considering what the other side may want (Bjola & Kornprobst, 2018). In the 21st century, governments, firms, and institutions across the globe collectively established diplomatic peace and treaties aimed to attain peace in the 21st century. The process entailed formulating policies and prudent techniques to address the overall global order, power, security, and environmental protection issues for the general international order. Diplomatic policies and regulation models help individual governments establish strong foreign policies to assist in crises and conflict resolution through defense dialogue, economic empowerment, and independent economic success.

Since the end of the cold war, governments have remained at peace, with diplomatic missions expanding beyond just states to non-profit organizations, international corporations, and influential interest groups. The policy has significantly influenced the global agenda in peacekeeping and has helped resolve severe war incidences in history. Moreover, the culture of unity has enabled the establishment of various intergovernmental and multinational players, thus fostering the spirit of unity and peace (United Nations, n.d.). Many entities now participate in international diplomacy, each contributing to the sovereignty, equality, and sustainability objectives in diverse sectors.

Diplomacy and international peace policy are rooted in the United Nations charter. The keywords and objectives of the UN charter preamble stipulate the major objective of international peace policy as saving future generations from the scourge of war. Diplomatic concerns have gained more significance since the establishment of the UN, and the global focus has been to attain and promote lasting peace in all societies. Achieving peace in the present era means the absence of war and incorporates the elements of well-being, people's demands, and expectations of peace (United Nations, n.d.). Peace is a complex concept to measure since it is a dynamic process that spans inter-state conflict to positive attitudes and involves both international and intra-national violence.

III. DIPLOMACY FAILURE AND ITS REFINEMENT

(A) Failed strategy

When does diplomatic failure occur? How would this failure affect global peace? Could it be a revolutionary international policy? Minimal research and literature reviews exist to discuss this issue. Existing international policymakers and activists want to view the problem from the blame game perspective, as either a weakness and an undermining of democracy or a threat to US hegemony and global power (Ritchie & Egeland, 2018). Diplomatic failure is primarily fueled by the larger political objectives of independent authorities, and these objectives are widely exogenous.

Hudson et al. (2019) relate the failures of diplomacy to policy failures. In his article, he argues that policy failure is dependent on the process of implementation. Several factors which influence performance are broadly seen as complex, multifaceted, and multileveled systems whose solutions should depend on the time and local context. There is a relationship between policy failure and diplomatic failure. Diplomacy in the modern state has been treated as war itself and a platform of proof of power between principle states (Hudson et al., 2019). For example, the war situation in Russia is seen as the proliferation of American hegemony and the

annexation of Russia. From just minor threats and proofs of superiority, states profoundly engage in armed and economic forces. The United States and the European Union have constantly implemented economic and public sanctions to address war situations. In his news article, Leonhardt calls for diplomacy to play its central role in initiating mediation and peace resolution processes for the Ukrainian case (Leonhardt, 2022). There is no better course of action, but a more strategic approach is required to reverse the situation and build a long-term global order.

(B) Failures in the Russo-Ukrainian war

War and conflicts are landmark moments, demonstrating the international community's failing diplomacy. The Russo-Ukrainian war consisted of has continued for so long, and the attacks between pro-separatist forces in Russia and the Ukrainian government must be stopped by appreciating that policies have evolved and there is a need to rethink the war from its most deep roots (Engle, 2014). The Russian goal was the annexation of Crimea. Still, with full invasion and military attacks, the conflict expanded significantly, with the Russian government tabling demands for Ukraine to remain a neutral country and restrain from being a member of NATO (Biersack & O'Lear, 2014). The rift between the European Union, the United States, and the Russian government can be traced back to the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. Russia agreed to leave Ukraine as a republic and acceded to the Budapest memorandum of security assurances. Russia's membership in the Budapest memorandum and the Charter of European Security marked the initial success of diplomacy, in which all global powers accepted to respect the inherent right of every participating state to have sovereignty and freedom of their own security arrangements and membership in treaties. After the separation of the Soviet Union, some governments joined the NATO block. Still, the Russian government has opposed any further NATO expansion to the East and cautioned Ukraine against being a NATO member.

The Russian opposition to Ukraine's country decisions is seen as the ignition point for the collapse of diplomacy. The war marks Russia's violation of the Budapest Memorandum and the demeaning of its diplomatic commitments in the charter of European society. Since 1994, the Russian government viewed any potential membership of Ukraine in NATO as a violation of western powers and constantly meddled in the nation's politics (Bowring, 2018). The "orange revolution" marked the early 21st-century color movements (protests). Russia's national security viewed any US and European plans in Ukraine as a threat, further interpreting it as an undermining of Russia's national security and any attempt to destabilize the East.

The European Union, the US, and Russian relationships took a sharp downturn after Russia's

2014 annexation of Crimea. After the attacks in 2014, the EU and the US imposed severe economic sanctions against Russia for its violation of Ukrainian territorial integrity. The sanctions have delicately hurt the country's energy, banking, and defense sectors, thus acting as a trigger for recent Russian attacks and conflicts with the US and its allied nations (Callahan, 2017). In response to the sanctions, Russia banned imports of EU agricultural products, further deteriorating diplomatic relations and potentially harming the economy and global prosperity if not addressed.

Since 2014, the Russian-Ukrainian war has presented various indicators that may have served as early warning systems, providing policymakers with potential solutions and insights to avert the spread of economic, social, and environmental wars. The horrific war in Ukraine presents a severe gap in the essence of diplomacy, and the only answer to addressing the gap holds relevance to the future of global stability. The Russian war in Ukraine is not only reshaping the strategic and political order in Europe; it is also upending the long-held assumptions about the intricate connections that are a signature of the global economy (YourCommonwealth, 2022). The Ukraine-Russia war has been in existence since Russia annexed Crimea on March 18, 2014. It has received massive condemnation from global society, which views it as a disruption of the global order (Leonhardt, 2022). Governments such as the UK and the European Union have previously imposed sanctions.

Existing research shows that the Russian government has been at the forefront of controlling central and western Europe. The war results from the blockage of American and NATO control of the Ukrainian territory. The West's deterrence strategies and diplomatic implications, such as sanctions, have failed to suppress the Ukrainian war. Most researchers believe that since 2014 Russian government has prepared its economy for a standoff with the West since the implications of the 2014 annexation of Crimea, which made Russia a victim of economic sanctions. The Russia-Ukraine war is a 21st-century sign of failed diplomacy. The international community must rise to new resolutions since the future crisis may also evolve, demanding more cooperative efforts to address it (Biersack&O'Lear, 2014). The Russian president's decision to invade Ukraine marked a turning moment and the inability of all diplomatic engagements to prevent the war. Since the Crimea war in 2014, the Russian government repeatedly issued warnings with precise demands to halt the Ukraine government from joining NATO. The invasion was preceded by diplomatic efforts by the US statehouse and European Union leaders who strategically sought to defuse tensions and prevent the attacks. The Russian government's preference for war and invasion in Ukraine might mark a start for blatant aggression in the future. Additionally, the Russians' expansion ties with China and Iran present

a more complex topic of collective efforts for the erosion of western resistance.

For decades, Russia has cemented strong economic ties and reliance across Europe due to the nation's endowed energy deposits, which has further complicated the American quest for a united response. The long-term preparation for war since the annexation of Crimea in 2014 insulated Russia from the global economy. The nation accounts for more than 1.7 percent of global output (Engle, 2014). Today, the economy remains isolated. Thus, common approaches to diplomatic sanctions may prove effective in averting the crisis despite the damaging financial and trade sanctions on countries allied to Ukraine. Callahan (2017) explains that economic interdependence causes the proliferation of insecurity. He argues that mutual benefits and economic ties can promote peace. Additionally, peace advocates call for opening trade between countries, arguing that countries open to global trade can be less worried about picking a fight with a single nation because they have diverse trading partners.

(C) The Gaps

While diplomacy may have failed in the Russia-Ukrainian incident, the same strategic approach can be argued to have won. Diplomacy has for a long time been the foundational guide to the establishment of voluminous security agreements, goals and the formation of global humanitarian institutions such as NATO. Russian aggression, though unavoidable, presents a new hope to global leaders. In one line of thinking, either diplomacy has failed in general, or Russia lacks any kind of diplomatic credibility at all, which would necessitate policy containment and collective diplomatic actions. Nations must address and factor in the priority of humanitarian issues alongside the restoration of democracy and territorial integrity to prevent any future crises from building into war.

The United States and Russia share the major responsibility of maintaining global order and nuclear deterrence stability. Revisiting the 1979 and 1983 incidences gives us a potential view of how war may lead to rivalry among nations. In 1961, the Russian government conceded to the Vienna Convention on diplomatic relations. The convention laid the foundation and bedrock of diplomacy. The period marked the start of a rivalry between the United States, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the Soviet Union emanating from the disagreements and controversies of the Cold War (Biersack & O'Lear, 2014). The failure of the diplomatic strategies represents a failure by the world's great powers to concede to the dynamism and evolving nature of international policy. Policies change, and so does the global order. The best process would be to use old diplomacy to bridge the existing global order and create a more globally accepted new demand for global prosperity.

IV. REFINED DIPLOMACY

(A) Concept

Diplomatic reforms are essential to protect future generations and help draw a line between democracy and autocracy, sovereignty and subjugation, and freedom and oppression. This article introduces the concept of "refined diplomacy" to refer to more accommodative cooperation between nations and diplomacy after the new world order. It is a proactive term meant to communicate the need for a more multipolar and refocused geopolitical regime where countries are more focused on impending natural disasters than territorial and power conflicts.

Hudson et al. (2019) suggest that the size and magnitude of a policy failure should be directly proportional to the need and urgency for policy change. The fact that diplomacy has failed does not mean nations should detest each other, but they should focus on more sustainable strategies to refine the lost diplomatic strength. Unless advanced democracy is embraced, no intervention whatsoever, either through diplomatic sanctions or military force, can solve the current Ukrainian crisis. Instead, the US, Russia, and allies must work together to refine diplomacy and welcome a new global order.

The concept of refined diplomacy instills the sacrificial aspect where each state must lose something to gain another. The United States has led the world order for decades, but increasing economic success has seen the world witness the US decline in its status as a global hegemon. America's capacity to assert global dominance, security, and influence has relied heavily on peace at home and in allied states for a long time. The increasing strength and emergence of global powers present a new realm of global and international politics to the world, and there has been a cauldron of tension in the geopolitical scope.

Over the past few years, the nation has increased multilateralism and global cooperation. Still, gaps in previous presidencies led to American isolationism, opening the path for middle powers to assert more influence and reshape the global order. Nations like China and Russia constantly question the role of the United States. Leonid views the international order as a system of relations susceptible to change for many reasons. Due to internal rebellions, territorial conflicts, industry, and commerce entail changes. The balance of power can also be significantly impacted and disrupted by the changing ideological paradigms. Thus, the global community should allow for the evolution of the international order realm and its ideological components.

V. ACTIONS FOR REFINED DIPLOMACY

Since World War II, the United States' most prominent rival has been the Soviet Union, and the

only means to change it is to revise the global order to safeguard the interests of both nations. Throughout the decade, the Soviet Union has had the ability to oppose American hegemony while not undermining US dominance in global politics. After a decade of turbulence, this world order has tremendously changed, leading to the rise of competitors. Gaufman (2017) explains that the global demand must change from West-led governance to co-governance by the West and East.

Refined diplomacy is a new form that focuses on shared democratization and averts American exceptionalism. The ideological divide on issues of globalization continues to raise uncertainties and struggles of American hegemony's depletion in the East. Failure to accommodate the new order will exacerbate security challenges and have far-reaching consequences for globalization and geopolitics (Grinin, 2009). Refined diplomacy provides win-win cooperation and could be the only option for restoring peace and order.

Refined diplomacy helps societies attain concrete global order and assures peace and prosperity. War is both costly and a risk to humans, and thus, every player must focus beyond diplomatic means to establish a peaceful and durable solution to attaining international peace (Hudson et al., 2019). Continued reluctance may cause irreconcilable positions between the West and Russia, and this lack of diplomatic solutions may further exacerbate the situation, leading to the possibility of war. Imposing refined-democracy goals means treating Ukraine as a neutral state (Biersack & O'Lear, 2014). According to Gaufman (2017), Russia expects to see Ukrainians categorized as culturally and politically part of Russia's influence. This proves why China exists as a close ally to Russia in destroying the current world order. The global system demands a new world order in which America does not attempt to westernize the countries by imposing its western dictates.

In the refined-diplomatic approach, America must shift from liberal idealism to a much more elaborate realism, and consistent refusal continues to impose more significant threats to the American community. Moreover, refining diplomatic approaches offers all nations and global players a viable alternative to renewed diplomatic and international peace engagements, which can assure the people of a successful future and diplomatic engagement.

Advanced and refined democracy also establishes the concept of economic ties and stability. Ritchie and Egeland (2018) stated that the stability of Europe forms the core element of peace, ending war and establishing a new global order. Since the disintegration of the Soviet Union three decades ago, the concept of economic links has been presented as a way to resolve issues between Russia and other countries and avoid outright aggression. A refined diplomatic strategy

will seek to integrate more dialogue and peaceful war and conflict resolution modes. Blakemore suggests a more imperial technique of integrating faith-based diplomacy into peace-making activities; a process that will use people-centered policies to achieve better policy objectives. Successful implementation of faith-based diplomacy is dependent on the full appreciation of current trends, dynamics, and challenges evident in the international environment.

VI. CONCLUSION

The establishment of the current global order came after the cold war, but most nations fail to consider that policy and rules are dependent variables on many external factors. Cairney (2013) explains that policy and regulations evolve when a failure occurs. Therefore, the only solution is to change. He draws from evolutionary theory to explain why international actors must embrace a more comprehensive understanding of the institutional roles and underlying exogenous constraints to help derive more positive beliefs and cooperation from the actors.

Failure of a policy to serve its intended purpose in both essence and capacity is frequently cited as a major reason for its replacement (Walsh, 2006). The changes may occur by providing alternative policies or new policy provisions. For example, the Russian-Ukrainian war has existed for almost a decade, and it can be concluded that diplomacy failed due to nations' resistance to change. Global powers have fought the changing nature of policies as well as the potential for new policies and international order (Walsh, 2006). Governments and major world powers such as China, the United States, Russia, and the European Union must admit to reforming policies and finding the most persuasive alternative policies and diplomatic agreements that allow new policy prescriptions and avoid failure through refined diplomacy.

In the Wilsonian concept of self-determination, he explains that the equality of nations forms the foundation of peace and equality of rights. The new global order and principles of refined diplomacy must focus on equality and shun the implications of nations' classification as big or small, powerful or weak. Instead, they should concentrate on democratic rights such as respecting sovereign sovereignty and the freedoms of the governed. Diplomacy is a revolutionary form of diplomacy in the 21st century, supporting and advocating for the new global order. If peace is to prevail, nations and superpowers need to put an end to measures of war prevention, such as economic sanctions, and military deterrence, which increase allied formation and hostility between countries. Instead, the international community should pursue more economic ties, corporations, shared influence, and defense diplomacy to establish complex relationships to attain peace. The future crisis may arise from non-political factors such as pandemics, weather calamities, or even the impacts of climate change. Such risks require

more collaboration and unity-tied between nations than conflicts and power imbalances.

VII. REFERENCES

- Biersack, J., & O'Lear, S. (2014). The geopolitics of Russia's annexation of Crimea: narratives, identity, silences, and energy. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 55(3), 247–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15387216.2014.985241>
- Bjola, C., & Kornprobst, M. (2018). *Understanding international diplomacy: Theory, practice, and ethics*. Routledge.
- Bowring, B. (2018). Who Are the "Crimea People" or "People of Crimea"? The Fate of the Crimean Tatars, Russia's Legal Justification for Annexation, and Pandora's Box. In *The Use of Force against Ukraine and International Law* (pp. 21–40). TMC Asser Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (2019). Open source preventive diplomacy and complexity. *Global Change Peace & Security*, 31(1), 95–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781158.2018.1495188>
- Brown, R. L. (2015). *The diplomatic power of international organizations*. Unpublished. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.2898.4808>
- Brown, S. (1994). *The causes and prevention of war* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cahill, K. M. (2013). Preventive diplomacy: stopping wars before they start.
- Cairney, P. (2013). What is evolutionary theory, and how does it inform policy studies? *Policy and Politics*, 41(2), 279–298. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557312x655486>
- Callahan, W. A. (2017). Cultivating power: Gardens in the global politics of diplomacy, war, and peace. *International Political Sociology*, 11(4), 360–379. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/olx017>
- Crossman, L. (2014). Macy's Latin American Fair: A Temple Built on the Anxieties of Inter/Americanism. *Material Culture Review*, 79, 60–77.
- De Magalhaes, J. C. (1988). *The pure concept of diplomacy* (Vol. 214). Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Diplomacy. (2017, January 8). *E-International Relations*. <https://www.e-ir.info/2017/01/08/diplomacy/>
- Engle, E. (2014). *A New Cold War-Cold Peace Russia, Ukraine, and NATO*. Louis ULJ.
- Gaufman, E. (2017). *Security threats and public perception*. Cham: Springer.
- Grinin, L. (2009). Evolution of world order. *EVOLUTION: Evolution and Big History: Dimensions, Trends, and Forecasts*.
- Grinin, L. E., Korotayev, A. V., & Rodrigue, B. H. (2011). Introduction. *Evolution and extensive history: From multiverse to galactic civilizations*. *Development*, 2, 5–19.

- Hocking, B., & Melissen, J. (2015). Diplomacy in the digital age. In The Hague: Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations.
- Huasheng, Z. (2004). China, Russia, and the US: their interests, postures, and interrelations in Central Asia. *Central Asia and the Caucasus*, 5.
- Hudson, B., Hunter, D., & Peckham, S. (2019). Policy failure and the policy-implementation gap: can policy support programs help? *Policy Design and Practice*, 2(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2018.1540378>
- Leonhardt, D. (2022, March 7). Preventing this war. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/07/briefing/russia-ukraine-war-us-involvement.html>
- Nicolson, H. (2001). The evolution of the diplomatic method.
- Ritchie, N., & Egeland, K. (2018). The diplomacy of resistance: power, hegemony, and nuclear disarmament. *Global Change Peace & Security*, 30(2), 121–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781158.2018.1467393>
- YourCommonwealth. (2022, February 24). *Russia-ukraine crisis: Diplomacy the way forward*. Retrieved March 30, 2022, from <https://www.yourcommonwealth.org/editors-pick/russia-ukraine-crisis-diplomacy-the-way-forward/>
- Scott-Smith, G. (2018). Special issue: the evolution of diplomacy. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 14(1), 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-018-0095-9>
- Swistek, G. (2012). The Nexus between public diplomacy and military diplomacy in foreign affairs and defense policy. *Connections*, 11(2), 79–86.
- United Nations. (n.d.). Peace and security | United Nations. Retrieved March 29, 2022, from <https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/peace-and-security>
- Walsh, J. I. (2006). Policy failure and policy change: British security policy after the cold war. *Comparative Political Studies*, 39(4), 490–518.
- 宋婧祎. (n.d.). New world order is the inevitable trend. *Com. Cn*. Retrieved March 29, 2022, from https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2017-08/21/content_30892589.htm
- (N.d.). Ndu.Edu. Retrieved March 29, 2022, from https://cco.ndu.edu/Portals/96/Documents/prism/prism_1-4/Prism_3-14_Grossman.pdf.
