



State, Governance And Regional Integration In Africa

Editors:

**Aloysius-Michaels Okolie
Hassan Saliu
Gerald Ezirim**

Published by the Nigerian Political Science Association, July 2019

Shuttle Diplomacy as an Instrument of Resolving Conflict and Redeeming the Image of the States in International Relations

Shedrach, Igboke C.

Department of Political Science
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Abstract

Over the years, shuttle diplomacy has been an instrument of resolving conflict and redeeming the image of the states in international relations. The main thrust of this work was to x-ray the importance of shuttle diplomacy in maintaining peace among nations. It has also been realized that this would reduce discord and conflict among states. The work equally analyzed the various achievement recorded or made by past leaders through shuttle diplomacy to maintain global peace. The paper examined the positive and negative impact of shuttle diplomacy on global security. The study was anchored on the integration theory to address the conflict among nation states. The research methodology used was qualitative. The work was descriptive in nature and made use of secondary sources such as textbooks, internet materials, magazines and newspapers. The study found out that conflict among nation states was a threat to global peace, citing the current case of Israel and Palestine. The paper concluded that integration among nation states was the bed rocked the global peace. It was recommended that United Nations should be strength to carry out their aims and objectives effectively without fear or favour. It was also recommended that states should desist from the action and inaction that are threat to global peace. The formation of association of countries at global, regional and sub-regional levels is to promote global peace.

Keywords: Shuttle Diplomacy, Mediation, United Nations Organizations, International Law.

Introduction

Over the years, shuttle diplomacy has been an instrument of resolving dispute among nation states, especially after World War II in 1945. The formation of association of countries at global, regional and sub-regional level is to promoting global peace. It was on this premise that the United Nations organization was formed in 1945 in San Francisco by 51 states to carried out this task, in order to prevent another world war. Although the United States of America has assumed the position of the UNO due to her economic and military superiority.

The UN was successor to the league of Nation, which had failed to effectively counter aggression in the 1930s. Like the league of nation, the UN was established with the mandate of promoting global peace and security among member states. It was also to help nip in the bud situation that could escalate into war of a high magnitude (Ola, 1997, p.54). It was equally to facilitate conditions that are conducive to peaceful co- existence of Nations of the world (Ayoni-Akeke, 2008, p.65).

In corroboration, Ukegbu (2016, p.23) avers that the purpose of creating the United Nations was to unite the people of the world, heal war wounds and prevent a re-occurrence of another world war. However, the paper was divided into five sections, section one introduced the topic. Section two explains some concepts such as shuttle diplomacy, mediation, united nation and international law. Section three trace the origin or development of shuttle diplomacy. Section four of the paper analyzed the efforts of the United States of America and UN in resolving dispute among While section five of the paper was conclusion.

Research Methodology

The study relied mainly on secondary sources of data drawn from text books, journals, official publications, conference papers, internet materials, newspapers, magazines and official documentaries that are relevant to the work. The analysis of data was based on deductions from the issues raised in the paper in the light of available data gathered.

Conceptual Dissection

Shuttle Diplomacy

The term, shuttle diplomacy was coined by the members of the media who followed Henry Kissinger, former secretary of state of the United States on his various short flights among Middle East capitals as he sought to deal with the fallout of the October 1973 *Yom Kippur* war. However, shuttle diplomacy is the negotiation conducted by a mediator who travels between two or more parties that are reluctant to hold direct discussions (George, 1990, p.45). In diplomacy and international relations, shuttle diplomacy is the action of an outside, party in serving as an intermediary between or among principals in a dispute, without direct principal to principal contact.

Originally and usually the process entails successive travel (“shuttling”) by the intermediary, from the working location of one principal, to that of another. In corroboration, Dhanani (1982, p.65) described shuttle diplomacy as the movement of diplomats between countries whose leaders refuse to talk directly to each other, in order to try, to settle the argument between them. UN mediators are conducting shuttle diplomacy between the two sides. The mediators adopted the term “Shuttle Diplomacy”

Mediation

Mediation is a practice under which, in a conflict, the services of a third party are utilized to reduce the differences or to seek a solution. It simply means a person or organization that tries to end a quarrel between two people, groups, countries etc by discussion. For instance, UN officials mediated between the rebel fighters and the government of Southern Sudan, Liberia, Sierra Leone etc. The former President of USA (Ford) has agreed to mediate the peace talks between Arab-Israeli dispute in 1974-1975.

Furthermore, mediation differs from “good offices” in that the mediator usually takes more initiative proposing terms of settlement. It differs from arbitration in that the opposing parties are not bound by prior agreement to accept the suggestion made. According to Ukegbu (2016, p.18), mediation refers to any process for resolving disputes, quarrels, problems or misunderstanding in which another person (the third party) helps the warring parties to negotiate a settlement.

United Nations Organization

United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 in San Francisco by 51 States after the World War II to prevent another World War. Prior to this time, the league of the Nations was established in 1919 shortly after the World War I (1914 – 1918) that led to the loss of lives and great suffering of people with the mandate of promoting international co-operation, peace and security among member States. Annan (1999) imports that the twentieth century stands out as a century of War, genocide and immense suffering. Indeed, it was a century with not only the highest number of wars but also the century in which the world witnessed two separate World Wars (1914-1918 and 1939 – 1945) and a cold war (1945-1989) that threatened to escalate into a nuclear holocaust.

Suffice is to say that the inability of the league of Nations to settle dispute among Nations led to the outbreak of the World War II in 1939, which was even more destructive than World War I. However, the United Nations was the successor to the League of Nations, which had failed to effectively counter aggression in the 1930s. It is currently made up of 193 member States.

Objectives of United Nations Organization (UNO)

- i. To maintain international peace and security through effective and collective measures to stop aggression and prevent a breach of peace.
- ii. To encourage all Nations to develop respect for fundamental human rights and freedom for all people without any discrimination based on race, language or religion.
- iii. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.
- iv. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character.
- v. To remove and prevent causes of wars.
- vi. To respect the sovereignty of every independent nation. This means that UN shall not intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of member states except when it is acting to enforce international peace and security.

International Law

The absence of rules and regulations in international relations is an invitation to chaos and anarchy. Giving credence to above assertion, international law is the set of rules generally regarded and accepted as binding in relations between states and

between nations (Slomanson, 2011, p.98). International law serves as a framework for the practice of stable and organized international solutions. In line with this submission, Charles (2010, p.234) described international law as the body of general normative principles and specific legal rules that govern the behavior of states in their relations with one another. No principle of international law is more important than state sovereignty. Oppenheim (1905, p.67) view international law as the body of customary and conventional rules which are considered legally binding by civilized states in their intercourse with each other.

Finally, Vyshinsky (1948) cited in Palmer (2010, p.185) defined international law as the sum total of the norms regulating relations between states in the process of their struggle and co-operation, expressing the will of the ruling classes of these states and secured by coercion exercised by states individually or collectively. International law, unlike national laws, derives not from actions of a legislative branch or other central authority, but from traditional and agreements signed by states. It also differs in difficulty of enforcement, which depends not on the power and authority of central government but on reciprocity, collective action, and international norms.

Theoretical Framework

The study is anchored on international integration theory to further the main arguments of this paper. The theory attempts to explain why states choose supranationalism, which challenges once again the foundations of realism (state sovereignty and territorial integrity (Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2012, p.345). It is a theory that has as its base David Mitterany's functionalism (Dougherty and Pfaltzgrafz, 2000, p.56). Dougherty went further to described integration as a process whereby political actors in several distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations and political activities toward a centre, whose institutions possess or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states. The term "integration" refers to a process whereby the quality of relations among autonomous social units (kingship, groups, tribes, cities, trade unions, trade associations, political parties) changes to such a way as to erode the autonomy of each and make it part of a larger aggregate. Integration theory is concerned with bringing together of two or more states so that they can form a larger body in order to be able to defend themselves and contribute to the promotion of world peace (Johari, 2012, p.234).

According to Goldstein and Pevehouse (2012, p.89), international integration refers to the process by which supranational institutions replace national ones, the gradual shifting upward of sovereignty from state to regional or global structures. The ultimate expression of integration would be the merger of several or many states into a single state or ultimately into a single world government. Such a shift in sovereignty to the supranational level would probably entail some version of federalism in which states or other political units recognize the sovereignty of a central government while retaining certain powers for themselves.

In this regard, international integration implies the coming together of states or institutions under the unions or association with a view to promote global peace and settle dispute among nation states. These functions are carried out by United

Nations (UN), African Union (AU), European Union (EU), Arab league, and sometimes United State America (USA), etc to increase international order and the rule of law to prevent another world war. The organization has power to suspend and intervene in any nation to save civilians from genocide or crimes against humanity perpetrated or allowed by their own government, followed the establishment of the concept of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) in 2005 by world leaders (Goldstein and Pevehouse 2012). In line with the premises, following the civil war in Sierra Leone, the government there runs war crimes tribunals jointly with the UN in 2003, indicted the sitting state leader in next door, Liberia, Charles Taylor for his role in the war's extreme brutality. He fled to Nigeria shortly after wars but was capture there and turned over to the tribunal in 2006. The case of former Yugoslavia, Slobodan Milosevic who ordered his forces to kill thousands of Muslims in Bosnia was arrested after 13 years in hiding is another good example. Arab League suspended Syria in 2011 as a consequence of government repression on during the Syrian civil war.

In corroboration, Johari (2013, p.57) avers that international integration is concerned with bringing together of two or more states so that they can form a larger body in order to be able to defend themselves and contribute to the promotion of world peace. This theory is related to shuttle diplomacy as an instrument of resolving conflict among nation states using UN and US as platform for proper understanding of the shuttle diplomacy is a good example of integration efforts till date.

In spite of the lofty ideals of integration theory, it has its own shortcomings, "Integration reduces states' ability to shield themselves and their citizens from the worlds many problems and conflict" (Goldstein and Pevehouse: 2011:354). This can be seen in the case of Venezuela in the 1990's whose open borders with Columbia resulted in the largest shipment of cocaine en route the United States. Over the years, terrorism had always made it difficult for states to open their borders to other state's citizens. Where there is unrestricted movement into a state, such as a state has made itself vulnerable to terrorist attacks.

Integration may imply greater centralization which can be freedom for individuals, local groups and the general populace (Goldstein, 2004, p.124). This situation can stifle initiatives on the part of countries involved, and also generate tension among the citizenry. This is because of the tendency towards dictatorship on the part of some countries that may become domineering within the group or association.

Lastly, there is the tension and struggle between nationalism and supranational loyalty (regionalism or globalism) (Goldstein, 2004,156). As countries aspire to promote a sense of belonging and loyalty among the citizens, they also seek to be committed to supranational bodies which they belonging and loyalty among the citizens, they also seek to be committed to supranational bodies which they belong.

The Origin of Shuttle Diplomacy

The term shuttle diplomacy was coined by the members of the media who followed Henry Kissinger, former Secretary of State of the United States under Richard Nixon on his various short flights among Middle east capitals as he

(Kissinger) sought to deal with the fallout of the October 1973 Yom Kippur War. After three weeks of fighting, a ceasefire found Israeli forces entangled with the Egyptian and Syrian forces. This presented President Richard Nixon and Kissinger with an opportunity to play a lead role in disengaging these armies from one another and possibly laying the groundwork for further steps to peacefully resolve the 25-year conflict. In January 1974, Kissinger helped negotiate the first Egyptian-Israeli disengagement agreement in eight days, and in May, he arranged a Syrian-Israeli disengagement after a month of intense negotiations. Kissinger's shuttle diplomacy secured one last deal in September 1975 with the conclusion of a second Egyptian-Israeli disengagement agreement.

However, the origins of the first shuttle started with Israel's proposals for disengagement with the Egyptians on January 4 and 5, 1974. Israel's proposals demonstrated to Kissinger that the two sides were close enough for him to engage in intensive diplomacy between Jerusalem and Cairo to find a way to negotiate a solution. Nixon, who had become severely distracted by the growing Watergate crisis, encouraged Kissinger to make the trip, but Nixon's involvement in this negotiation and the ones to follow before his resignation was minimal.

In this regard, following the conclusion of this Egyptian-Israeli disengagement agreement, commonly known as Sinai I, U.S. attention moved to Syria, the other country with armies entangled with Israel's forces. Kissinger hoped moving on the Syrian-Israeli front would lead the Arab members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC) to lift the oil embargo they had imposed on the United States in retaliation for American assistance to Israel during the war.

Unlike the relatively short negotiations that led to the Egyptian-Israeli disengagement agreement, negotiations for a Syrian-Israeli disengagement proved far more arduous and took much longer. By March 18, OPEC lifted the oil embargo, but it would be subject to review on June 1. With a need to show progress in negotiations between Israel and Syria before then, Kissinger moved forward in laying the groundwork for another shuttle. Through the end of March and most of April, Kissinger met separately in Washington with Israeli officials and a senior-level Syrian emissary to discuss the groundwork for negotiations.

By the end of April, Kissinger decided the time was right to begin his second shuttle in the Middle East. On May 1, he left for Jerusalem to begin nearly a month of intense negotiations between the Israelis and Syrians. The negotiation centered on the town of Quneitra in the Golan Heights, three kilometers within the zone Israel had captured during the June 1967 Arab-Israeli War. Since Quneitra did not include any Israeli settlements, the Syrians wanted the town returned as part of any agreement, as well as the territory taken during the October war. After the first week of negotiations, the Syrians and Israelis had shared with Kissinger their views of a line of disengagement. They were close to one another; however, control of Quneitra and three hills that surrounded the town remained the key stumbling block. By mid-May, both sides had agreed to compromises that put their proposals within a few hundred meters of each other, and Israel had assented to a civilian Syrian presence in Quneitra. Despite the progress, neither side would close the gap needed to complete

an agreement. On May 16, Kissinger offered an American proposal that sought to find the common ground necessary to reach a compromise. Both sides wanted modifications to this American proposal, however, and negotiations dragged on for another two weeks with Kissinger almost ceasing the negotiations on three separate occasions. Finally, on May 31, Syria and Israel signed a disengagement agreement. On August 9, Nixon resigned the presidency, and Vice-President Gerald Ford assumed the office while keeping Kissinger on board as both Secretary of State and National Security Adviser.

Efforts of the United Nations and the United States of America in Resolving Dispute among Nation-States

Arab-Israeli Dispute, 1974-1975 as case study

Over the years, the United States of America has evolved to meet the demands of different conflicts and a changing political landscape. In this regard, the Former Secretary of State of the U.S, Henry Kissinger engaged in shuttle diplomacy in January 1974 to resolve the Arab-Israeli dispute after the October 1973 war. After three weeks of fighting, a ceasefire found Israeli forces entangled with the Egyptian and Syrian forces. However, this presented Richard Nixon, former U.S President and his Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger with an opportunity to play a lead role in disengaging these armies from one another and possibly laying the groundwork for further steps to peacefully resolve the 25 years conflict. Against this backdrop, Kissinger helped negotiate the first Egyptian-Israeli disengagement agreement in eight days in January, 1974.

Syrian-Israeli Dispute 1974-1975

Following the conclusion of Egyptian-Israeli disengagement agreement, commonly known as Sinai Interim, U.S attention moved to Syria, for other country with armies entangled with Israel's forces. Unlike the relatively short negotiations that led to the Egyptian-Israeli disengagement agreement, negotiations for a Syrian – Israeli disengagement proved far more arduous and took much longer.

However, through the end of March, 1974 and of most of April, Kissinger met separately in Washington with Israeli officials and a senior level Syrian, emissary to discuss the groundwork for negotiations. By the end of April, Kissinger decided the time was right to begin his second shuttle in the Middle East. On May 1, he left for Jerusalem to begin nearly a month of intense negotiations between the Israel and Syrians.

In this regard, after the first week of negotiations in April, 1974, the Syrians and Israelis had shared with Kissinger their views of a line or conditions of disengagement. Both side refused to close the gap needed to complete the agreement. On May 16, Kissinger offered an American proposal that sought to find the common ground necessary to reach a compromise. Both sides again refused to accept the proposal and negotiations dragged on for another two weeks with Kissinger almost ceasing the negotiations on three separate occasions.

Finally, on May 31, 1974, Syrian and Israel signed a disengagement agreement. This is another prime example of shuttle diplomacy. U.S also resolved Kuwait-Iraq war in 1990 when late Saddam Hussein invaded and annexed Kuwait, and the catastrophic Iraq – Iran war in 1988.

The United Nations Efforts on Settling Dispute among Nation State: The Case Study of Syrian, 2012-2018

Syrian gained independence in 19406 from France. Since then, it contends with unstable government. This stem from the fact that in less than three years of self rule, there was a military coup in March 1949 and it was subsequently followed by two other coup d'etat that same year. However, the successful protests that led to regime change in Tunisia and Egypt in early 2011, March precisely made millions in Syria believe that they can replicate this in their own country and change their authoritarian regime, but this was not to be (Sharwood, 2016). According to Zachary (2007, p.12), Syria's civil war has grown over more complex in the six years since protesters first challenged the government.

In line with this background, the United Nations set up peacekeeping mission in 2012 as a result of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2043 in response to the Syrian civil war. It was commanded by Norwegian Major General Robert Mood until 20 July, 2012 followed by Lieutenant General Babacar Gaye from Senegal. Although observers remain in the country, Mood suspended their mission on June 16, 2012 citing "escalating violence". Observers will conduct no further patrols and stay in their current positions until the suspension is lifted. On 20 July 2012, the Security Council extended UNSMIS (the United Nations supervision mission in Syria) for a final period of 30 days. According resolution 2059, the Council would only consider more extensions in the event that the Secretary-General reports and the security Council confirms the cessation of the use of heavy weapons and a reduction in the level of violence sufficient by all sides to allow UNSMIS to implement its mandate.

Since then, the negotiation is on-going between UN Officials and Syrian government to resolve the civil war in the country, despite the forces from two super powers, United States of America via Russia and their allies. In corroboration, Dmitri (2017,p.45) in his argument opines that Russia's foreign expeditions can reduce the immense domestic pressure on the regime and hence the need to intervene in Syria at least to curb American influence and to undermine the North Atlantic Treaty organization (NATO). Along the line, Hamilton (2017,.p.89) opines that apart from preserving the long friendship between Russia and Syria, the need to stop the growing sunni terrorism in the world and curbing America's agenda of regime change especially in countries friendly with Russia was uppermost to Russia.

Conclusion

Shuttle Diplomacy as an instrument of resolving conflict and conducting international relations has contributed immensely in promoting global peace and stabilizing relations among nations. Though the anarchic nature of the international system makes it difficult if not in possible for States like U.S via Russia and their

allies to work together to promote global peace. For example, the on-going civil war in Syria is between America via Russia and their allies that want regime change (US), as they did in Lybia, Egypt, Tunisia etc. However, it is an imperative to checkmate the behaviour of States that opposed harmonies living in the world through UN to deter the actions and inactions of some States.

References

- Ayeni-Akeke, O.A. (2008) *Foundations of Political Science*, Ibadan: Ababa Press Limited.
- Charles and Gregory (2010), *The Global future. A Brief introduction to world politics*. 3rd ed. New York: Wadsworth.
- Dhanani, G (1982) "Israeli withdrawal from Sinai" Economic and Political weekly, Economic and Political weekly. JSTOR4370919.
- Dmitri, L (2017) *Russia Resolve: Why Syria matters* put in (www.the-globeandmail.com).
- Dougherty, J. & Pfaltzgrafe, JR (2000). *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey*. Longman.
- Goldstein J.S. & Pavehouse, J.C (2011) *International Relations (Ninth Edition)*, United States: Longman (Pearson International Edition).
- Goldstein J.S. (2004). *International Relations*. Delhi: (Singapore) P.T.E. Ltd.
- Goldstein J.S & Pavehouse (2013). *International Relations (10th Edition)*, United States: Longman (Pearson International Edition).
- Hamilton, R. (2017) *What Russia wants in Syria* (www.fpri.org/of2ndmay).
- Johari, J.C. (2013). *International Relations and Politics: Theoretical Perspectives in the Post- cold War Era*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishes Private Limited.
- Ola, J.T. (1997). *The Concept and Practice of International Relations*, Gwagwalada-Abuja: JOECRYSS Ventures Nig.
- Palmer and Perkins (2010): *International relations*. 3rd ed. H. I. T. B. S. Publisher, India.
- Stornanson, William (2011). *Fundamental Perspectives on International Law*. Boston, USA, Wadsworth.
- Ukegbu, M.N (2016) *Basic Civic Education*: MEYBIKS Nigeria Publishers.