

Hostile Diplomacy Where one or more countries are engaged in armed clashes or when there is a substantial possibility that fighting could result, diplomacy is conducted in a hostile environment. The maneuvering surrounding the U.S. demand on Afghanistan that it surrender those responsible for the 9-11 terrorist attacks fell distinctly within the range of **hostile diplomacy**. Almost immediately, the United States moved to deploy a massive Navy flotilla centered around the aircraft carriers *Enterprise*, *Carl Vinson*, and *Theodore Roosevelt* to the Indian Ocean. On September 16, Bush also instructed, "The secretary of state should issue an ultimatum against the Taliban today warning them to turn over bin Laden and his al-Qaeda or they will suffer the consequences." If the Taliban do not comply, Bush instructed his advisers, "We'll attack with missiles, bombers, and boots on the ground. . . . We are going to rain holy hell on them."¹²

Adversarial Diplomacy An environment of **adversarial diplomacy** occurs at a less confrontational level when two or more countries' interests clash but when there is little or no chance of armed conflict. A great deal of diplomacy involving economic issues occurs in adversarial circumstances as countries press other countries to accede to their wishes. Russia and the United States have disagreed strongly about the proposals of President George W. Bush to abandon the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972 in order to try to build a ballistic missile defense system. Russia's president Putin tried to head off the Bush move by arguing it would upset deterrence and also by attempting to enlist the support of the European members of NATO, many of whom have doubts about the U.S. move. Russia's weakness left little that it could do when Bush formally announced in December 2001 that he would go ahead. Putin's comments were moderate, but other Russian leaders expressed anger. A former Russian ambassador to Washington complained that "the U.S. used our enormous help to conduct the anti-terrorist operation in Afghanistan. . . . [then] announces its position on ABM. It's a sign, and a bad sign at that." And a leader of one of the party's in the Russian parliament called the move proof that the United States is "a superpower that is trying to dictate its rules to the world."¹³

Bu
po
pe
Re
sia
Ru
wa
bec
tre
ous
pro
fea
my
dir
exp
to s
Rus
foo

Coa
opp
beco
deal
tives
insta
time
Duri
lead
gare

unila
than
the s
could
dition
presi
Mr. E
elicit
one c
2002-
garne

Medic
of me

At other times, adversarial diplomacy addresses less critical issues. President Bush in early 2002 ordered tariff increases of up to 30 percent on foreign steel imports. Washington claimed the move was to offset unfair pricing by foreign competitors to the U.S. steel industry; critics charged the move was more about giving Republicans a political boost in big steel-producing states. Whatever the cause, Russia and other countries that export steel to the United States struck back. With Russia's lost revenues estimated at \$750 million a year, Moscow announced that it was barring U.S. poultry imports, which amounted in 2001 to about \$800 million, because of health concerns. With tongue in beak, the press quickly dubbed the contretemps the "cold chicken war." To the diplomats involved, however, it was serious. The American ambassador to Russia termed the dispute, "the number one problem in U.S.-Russia relations in the past month," and he indicated that so many feathers had flown that diplomacy had "engaged at least five cabinet ministers on my side, and even President George W. Bush, who has spoken to President Putin directly about this."¹⁴ In August 2002, this dispute was settled and U.S. chicken exports to Russia resumed fully. For its part, the United States conceded the need to supply Russian officials with health certificates for the poultry purchased by Russia. Thus, Russia was, at least on paper, assured of safer chicken and a healthier food supply.

Coalition Diplomacy When a number of countries have similar interests, often in opposition to the interest of one or more other countries, then **coalition diplomacy** becomes a significant aspect of international activity. National leaders spend a good deal of time and effort to build coalitions that will support the foreign policy initiatives of their country or of other international actors that they support. When, for instance, Iraq invaded Kuwait in August 1990, President George Bush spent much time and effort in rounding up international support for military action against Iraq. During the first four days of the crisis Bush made 23 phone calls to a dozen foreign leaders, and personally flew to Colorado to consult with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who was coincidentally speaking at a conference there.

When President George W. Bush entered the White House, he favored a more unilateralist approach to diplomacy, and was less interested in building coalitions than his father had been. The complexities of combating global terrorism provided the son a lesson that his father had learned earlier. The younger Bush found that he could not succeed without building a broad coalition in support of U.S. goals. In addition to a high volume of phone calls to heads of government around the world, a presidential adviser speaking in January 2002 indicated that "Since September 11, Mr. Bush has met personally with nearly 80 foreign leaders, using each session to elicit whatever backing the other nation was willing to give."¹⁵ Along the same lines, one of the primary reasons for the slow development of the war with Iraq in 2002–2003 was the Bush administration's efforts, which proved unsuccessful, to garner relatively wide support, especially within the UN Security Council.

Mediation Diplomacy Unlike hostile, adversarial, or coalition diplomacy, the use of **mediation diplomacy** occurs when a country that is not involved directly as one

of the parties tries to help two or more sides in conflict resolve their differences. The United States has been involved for decades in an attempt to mediate the conflict between Israel and its Arab neighbors, especially the Palestinians, as told on the Web site in *Palestinians: A Nation Without a State*, previously referenced in chapter 4. From Henry Kissinger's shuttle diplomacy in the 1970s to the various attempts in the 1980s and 1990s to mediate peace in the region, U.S. officials have played central roles in working toward peace. But to date, while many delegations have been formed to discuss possible solutions to the conflict over autonomy and territory in Israel/Palestine, violence and conflict still defines the politics of the area.



resolu
on con
learned
I
players
eral di
best, le
they ar
unilate
of the r
tions ar
A
constra
mode of
involves
diploma
ished wo
is a far-r

M

The Wor
ern diplo
also mark
tionalistic
New pow
they joine
diplomacy
cludes sev
parliamen
diplomacy
forms," bu

Expa

Modern dip
ague Con
cipants, in
or nationa
oday, the
ly global

Mult

use of c
ern era
rise of n
regional