

# Buddhist Philosophy in the Practice of Diplomacy

1. Ushakiran Gnawaly

<https://doi.org/10.3126/lumbinip.v11i01.93798>

2. Vedraj Gnawaly

---

*Submitted: 26 January, 2026 || Reviewed: 17 March, 2026 || Revised: 3 April, 2026*

---

## Abstract

*Contemporary diplomacy is facing systemic decline. The proliferation of powerful non-state actors, the dominance of coercive strategies, and the repeated failure of peace negotiations collectively indicate not a crisis of diplomatic skill but a crisis of diplomatic foundation. This paper argues that the failure of contemporary diplomacy is ontological rooted in the false premise that states and actors make decisions in isolation, their interests fundamentally separate from one another. This premise produces zero-sum thinking, coercive choices, and the treatment of negotiation as an instrument of narrow self-interest. Drawing on Buddhist philosophy, this paper proposes that the doctrine of Pratītyasamutpāda or dependent origination dismantles this false premise at its root by establishing radical interdependence as the fundamental nature of reality. From this ontological foundation, the paper applies the ethical framework of Panchsheel across two levels individual diplomatic conduct and state foreign policy as a philosophically coherent and historically grounded reorientation of diplomacy away from coercion and toward sustainable peace.*

*Keywords: Diplomacy, Buddhist philosophy, Dependent Origination, Pancasila Coercive Diplomacy, International Relations*

## Introduction

As the world becomes increasingly interconnected, diplomacy the major instrument that is required to manage the interconnectedness is facing systemic decline. The global peacefulness has deteriorated every year since 2014, conflicts are becoming internationalized by 175 percent since 2010, expenditure on peace building and keeping are at just 0.52 per cent of the total military spending (Institute for Economics and Peace). World military expenditure reached \$2718 billion in 2024 in all regions of the world, with over 100 countries around the world raising their military spending in 2024 (SIPRI). Nearly 40 percent of peace negotiations since 1975 have collapsed

---

1. [ushakirangnawaly@lbu.edu.np](mailto:ushakirangnawaly@lbu.edu.np) (Assistant Lecturer, LBU)

2. Assistant Professor, TU

with in the five years of inception, resulting in either wars, or spoilers to further negotiate. The repeated failure of major peace deals and negotiation to broker, are all recession indicators of diplomacy.

As the current international system witnesses an unprecedented level of interconnectedness making the that the domestic and international divide inevitably blurry, and the traditional rules of engagement are in need to be redefined. Keohan and Nye conceptualized the current condition as complex interdependence, where the world is deeply interconnected in terms of economic, political, and security issues: climate change, conflicts, wars, and genocides, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. all of which require states to co-exist and come up with collective solutions (Walker 150). This is timely because, under this condition, actions in one dimension reverberate across others (Saaida 1).

The need for diplomacy has become more apparent than ever. Yet, the conventional practice of diplomacy faces several structural challenges, leading one to questioning its efficacy. The twenty-first century diplomacy or post-Westphalian diplomacy (Oğurlu 2019) has seen proliferation of non-state actors as the drivers of negation for peace and war, similarly the induced importance to coercive form of diplomacy has fundamentally fractured and eroded the moral foundation upon which diplomacy rests upon.

Upon these developments, this paper argues that the failure of diplomacy today is not merely structural or strategic; it is ontological. Contemporary diplomacy rests upon the false premise that states and other actors make decisions in isolation; their interests fundamentally separate from one another. This has produced zero-sum thinking, coercive choices, and the treatment of negotiation as a business-like instrument, making diplomacy decline inevitable. Buddhist philosophy, through the doctrine of *Pratītyasamutpāda*- dependent origination challenges these false premises at their ontological root, simultaneously offering through the ethical framework of *Pancasila* not an alternative diplomatic technique, but a fundamental reorientation of diplomacy towards vibrancy.

## **Statement of the Problem**

Although the international system operates under conditions of complex interdependence where states must cooperate to coexist, conventional diplomacy is increasingly failing to deliver effective outcomes. In the post-Westphalian era, the proliferation of powerful non-state actors including multinational corporations, the media, and the military-industrial complex has fragmented negotiations. These actors pursue parallel agendas that contradict state interests, erode legitimacy, and obstruct consensus. This challenge is aggravated by the dominance of coercive

diplomacy, which relies on threats, economic sanctions, and peace through strength rhetorics.

These structural weaknesses have produced repeated diplomatic breakdowns revealing a critical gap in contemporary diplomatic theory and practice. There is a glaring absence of an ethical and ontological foundation capable of managing fragmented authority and achieving genuine cooperative outcomes in contemporary diplomacy. This paper argues that genuine diplomatic renewal requires not strategic adjustment, but ontological reorientation grounded in the Buddhist doctrine of dependent origination and the ethical framework of *Pancasila*.

## **Objectives**

The study pursues the following objectives.

- a. To contextualize diplomacy's historical evolution against its modern decline.
- b. To posit and critique the debate the death of diplomacy.
- c. To explore an alternative diplomatic framework grounded in Buddhist ontology.

## **Methodology**

This qualitative research draws on secondary sources including peer-reviewed journal articles and scholarly monographs across the fields of international relations, diplomatic theory, and Buddhist philosophy. The analysis proceeds through critical examination of contemporary diplomatic practices and philosophical reinterpretation of Buddhist ontology as applied to international relations. The paper's claim to reinterpret the Buddhist principles of Panchsheel for modern diplomacy necessarily takes an interdisciplinary approach, bridging Buddhist philosophy and international relations theory.

## **Limitations**

The research exhibits axiological limitations, as the author's value judgments are shaped by cultural and philosophical perspectives as well as interpretations of diplomatic paradigms.

## **Conceptualizing Diplomacy**

Traditionally, diplomacy was defined as the management of international relations by means of negotiations, managed by ambassadors and envoys. This traditional

definition is a too narrow conceptualization of diplomacy that cannot aptly address the increasingly important non-state actors that make up the international system in today's world. The rise of non-state actors, including non-state armed actors, rebel groups and insurgents, and private military and security companies in the international system, has meant that the the traditional state-centric interpretation to diplomacy began to weaken. Nation-states have become enmeshed in a complex network of global governance that have emerged as independentactors with the assumed capacity to compete with states (Oğurlu 177).

Definition posited by Hedley Bull is relevant. Bull views diplomacy as the conduct of relations between states and other entities in world politics by official agents and by peaceful means (Wiseman & Sharp 257). This definition broadens the understanding, where diplomacy is not only the affairs of state actors but also includes the interaction of a wide range of actors, including intergovernmental organizations. In summation, we understand that diplomacy or the practice of it is dynamic, with its two essential components of diplomacy that can be traced. First, diplomacy involves communication between state actors through the collection, interpretation, and dissemination of information about the interests of the state and other actors. Secondly, it involves peaceful conflict resolution through negotiations when interests diverge or do not properly overlap (Rathbun 11). Through these functions, diplomacy seeks to maintain stable and functional relations with diverse political entities while resolving interstate differences without the use of force.

Yet despite its conceptual diversification, diplomacy has failed to develop a corresponding ethical evolution. The proliferation of non-state actors combined with interest-driven diplomatic practice has yielded repeated failures in sustaining peaceful negotiations giving rise to narratives of the death of diplomacy.

## **Death of Diplomacy**

### **Rise of non-state actors**

The death of diplomacy begins with a point often made in scholarship; states themselves no longer hold exclusive sovereignty, having ceded authority to non-state actors. This condition has fundamentally altered the way diplomacy functions. Hence, it becomes pertinent to examine why the rise of non-state actors makes the conduct of diplomacy difficult. Firstly, as non-state actors increasingly become entangled with state affairs, this impacts diplomacy, which becomes an activity of fulfilling their own interests. This interest then translates into policies, essentially impacting the diverse domestic and foreign policies of other countries. Secondly,

as proposed by King and Patrick Le Galès (62), non-state actors at varying levels exercise authority once reserved to sovereign states.

- a The regulatory competence: where non-state actors can define as well as interpret collectively binding rules and public policies.
- b operational capacity: whereby they have the power to monitor, implement, and enforce rules and policies by allocating appropriate means- including capital, coercion, administration, technical equipment, and expertise.
- c legitimating power: they could justify the rules and policies that they proposed in action to ensure a high level of voluntary compliance

The proliferation of non-state actors and the equipping of these types of authority complicate diplomacy as conflict management; security and negotiation efforts are no longer exclusively state-centric, where diplomacy requires consideration of multiple actors. Today, the American arms industry is the largest in the world, in 2024, with four of the world's top five companies: Lockheed Martin, RTX, Northrop Grumman, and General Dynamics are based in the USA (Scarazzato et al.) These military industries utilize massive in-house lobbying activities, direct engagement with congresspersons and policy makers, and simultaneously create softer influences through the funding of think tanks, media campaigns, and academic works that support the industry's policies and goals.

Why does this matter in diplomatic negotiations? It matters because the core of diplomacy has been to represent the collective will of people through their sovereign state. Negotiations are no longer conducted in the quarters of states' collective interests and on the interests of powerful non-state actors. They spend enormous resources to sway not only public opinion but also state interests. Further alarming is that this penetration is not incidental, but it is structural. The American military industrial complex has not only led to poor outcomes for American national security and foreign policy, but it has also significantly harmed international peace, especially by helping to fuel conflicts and human rights abuses in various regions of the world (Vittori). When the very foundation of diplomacy is compromised by the penetration of non-state actors and their interest diplomacy becomes performative rather than a genuine exercise.

## **Coercive diplomacy**

Diplomacy that relies upon threat of force can never be both intelligent and peaceful, said Morgenthau (Constantinou et al.). Coercive diplomacy that utilizes military threats and or force in negotiation, this paperer argues is the dominant strategy of conventional diplomacy today. This dominant mode is no longer about negotiation and coexistence; but about an inward-looking and what's in it-for me approach in

all dealings. In doing so, long dead is diplomacy that requires patience, persistence, empathy, boldness, and willingness to talk to even the presumed enemy (Cohen). At its safest level, coercive diplomacy utilizes threats and symbolic use of force coupled with carrots and assurances, with its purposes being to obtain compliance without escalating the need to use force. During the situation of heightened conflict, coercive diplomacy utilizes brute force and imposes compliance through military defeat (Constantinou et al. 477).

Various scholarships point out how this form of diplomacy ideally works. Thomas C. Schelling argued that coercive diplomacy ideally works either through compliance or deterrence. The compellent threats would require states to change or comply with their behavior, whereas deterrence threats aim to prevent the target state from changing its behavior (Türkcan). Yet, the paper is of the argument that military coercion and diplomacy is any oxymoron. The recent revival of Peace through strength narrative by Trump administration captures this contradiction. Because diplomacy and military coercion are mutually exclusive alternatives that employ different instruments and serve very different ends (Constantinou et al.).

Despite these inherent contradictions, coercive diplomacy is the prevailing practice in contemporary international relations. Recent examples include the 12 days war led by US- Israeli campaign against Iranian military and nuclear sites, where American strategy utilizes coercion to extract behavioral changes that aligns with US led vision of regional stability (Alrebh), the abduction of Venezuela's president Nicolas Maduro and forcing Venezuelan government to operate with a gun to its head all for the American goal of preeminence in the western hemisphere (Stepansky). This turn to coercive diplomacy is largely influenced by the non-state actors' influence in decision-making power. Diplomatic processes are set up as window-dressing at best and distraction at worst, with real outcomes decided elsewhere (Rapnouil). This paper argues that those real negotiations happen in the quarters of defense industries.

Further, when conflicts profit these industries, it comes as a no surprise for diplomatic norm to turn coercive, inducing the excessive use of military, with diplomacy used as a business-like instrument. The status quo's commitments to the defense industry rest on the policy justifications linking arms sales as US interest. The massive sales of arms to the Gulf gave rise to narratives that these arms sales would create favorable regional outcomes for America (Marshall). Yet, these immense in house lobbying and influence by these non-state actors for America to push for coercive military methods of dealing has generated a glaringly absent leverage for America in terms of its negotiation success in the Middle East (Marshall).

If diplomacy is to be judged by its ability to uphold peace, then the conventional form has produced precisely the opposite.

## **Negotiation Failures**

Geopolitical fragmentations, conflicts, plunders, and prolonged genocide suggest to us that the world has become less peaceful over the past two decades. Nuclear-armed states either maintain or expand their arsenal since 2022, while great-power rivalry fuels new forms of arms race using advanced technologies, from AI-enabled drones to counter-space systems. Moreover, internationalized intrastate conflicts, where foreign troops fight inside another state, have increased 175%, drawing 78 countries into wars beyond borders. This failure in peaceful negotiation is further aggravated by the inclusion of non-state actors in diplomatic dealings. By influencing various decisions in diplomacy from shaping threat perceptions to influencing decision making process, the American Military industrial complex has reinforced the US inclination to use force in resolving international issue, which has in turn led to intensification of regional and global conflicts (Wang 13). Military industrial complex pushes US to actively seek and fabricate enemies to justify expanding of military expenditures and launching coercive military operations from the 1991 Gulf war to the 2003 Iraq war, Afghanistan war, intervention in Syria. Scholars argue that without Military Industrial complex promotion the US tendency towards frequent wars and military intervention would be difficult to sustain (Wang 13). These coercive strategies have rarely been effective in negotiating peace. Much of Peace through strength rhetoric has remained ineffective. Militarily powerful states have not been better at their coercive strategies, with success rate of coercive threats against the targets is only 36 percent (Türkcan). Here we can conform the argument that we are witnessing the age of brutalization of diplomacy (Rapnouil 727).

When fragmented authority between states and non-state actors enters diplomatic negotiations, with each actor primarily pursuing its own narrow interests, diplomacy loses its moral purpose entirely. Powerful non-state actors, particularly the military-industrial complex, actively push states toward coercive forms of diplomacy. While these choices generate substantial profits to them, they produce highly unfavorable outcomes for international peace and stability, which are the very goals diplomacy is meant to serve.

This leads to the conclusion that contemporary diplomacy is failing not primarily due to a lack of skill or expertise on the part of diplomats, but because of the very foundation upon which it now rests. The ontological assumption of diplomacy has been that States, and other actor's decisions in diplomacy are separate from each other where one's actions remain in isolation to others. The result is a fundamental ethical gap in its practice, that prioritizes short-term commercial and strategic gains over long-term peace and collective security. It is precisely this ontological gap that Buddhist philosophy addresses.

## **Buddhist Approach to International Relations and Diplomacy**

A Buddhist perspective on diplomacy requires one to reinterpret the very foundational understanding of the current international system. The preceding section established that contemporary diplomacy rests upon a false ontological assumption that states and actors make decisions in isolation; their interests fundamentally separate from one another. It is precisely this assumption that Buddhist philosophy challenges at its root, offering not a diplomatic technique but an entirely different understanding of the nature of reality itself.

Where IR theory describes complex interdependence as a feature of current international system, Buddhism goes further. Buddhism asserts that every functioning thing that we perceive arises in dependence on its cause and condition, much like a rainbow that appears to our senses when heat, light, and moisture come together, and when these conditions change, it dissolves (Long 20). This principle is known as the doctrine of dependent origination, *Paticca-sammuppada* in Pali and *Pratītyasamutpāda* in Sanskrit. This doctrine asserts that reality, including the self, lacks a fixed inherent nature and that all things are inherently impermanent and the reality that we perceive is simply the product of ever-changing cause and conditions (20). This is expressed in the poetic verse:

When this is, that is  
This arises, that arises  
When this is not, that is not.  
This ceasing, that ceasing (20)

The doctrine of dependent origination identifies that the failure to appreciate the full extent of this condition is the ultimate source of all conflicts and interstate wars. By the same light, the true understanding of dependent origination becomes the alternative to the practice of politics and diplomacy, one that is peaceful and sustainable.

The IR theory's notion of complex interdependence argues that the current condition of interdependence has arisen merely as a character of the international system, especially with the advent of globalization. The Buddhist perspective of radical interdependence, on the other hand, argues that such interdependence is not merely a characteristic of the current international system but a fundamental truth of existence itself. Moreover, the theory of complex interdependence describes how actors in the international system are connected, but it does not explain the true nature of the connection. Buddhist radical interdependence provides an ontological basis that reality is radically interdependent. This means that the self and all other phenomena lack a fixed or inherent autonomous nature of their own. While thinking of self and other entities like states in terms

of solidity or politics, such as organizing societies or managing and making decisions, could be helpful, these are just conventional notions of reality. These conventional notions of reality are simply forms of truth which can help us function in the world, the skillful means *upaya*, and if used properly, can lead individuals to realize the ultimate truth, which is that everything lacks inherent existence of their own- no self and are interdependent (21).

What do we mean by having no self? Take for example, what makes a state? States or state systems are projections and institutionalization of individual ways of thinking built upon intersubjective consensus. States are social constructs; the underlying nature of the state and the state system is dependent on the individuals that comprise it. Individuals can shape the characters of their minds, and in a similar fashion the very institutions that they comprise like the state (21). This in turn lacks a permanent essence; individuals and states are therefore all changeable phenomena.

This means that the separation of self and other phenomenon is delusional or ignorance, that there is a radical interdependence between individuals and between humans and their social and natural environment. Thus, the predominant political reality that views insecurity and conflict as naturally arising, independent of any other externality is falsified by Buddhism. This deluded way of thinking leads to a fundamental fallacy in the practice of diplomacy and statecraft. The desire or the belief that protecting and preserving one's own desires and harming and destroying the enemy will bring security and happiness is an inherently false premise (22).

When one moves away from self to no self, we focus on collective experience, our familiarity with the true nature of no self helps reduce egoistic concerns and recognize that the pursuit of their happiness and welfare is not fundamentally detached from the well-being of others. Radical interdependence, if realized, can lead to a greater sense of connection, community, tolerance, responsibility, and a universal sense of humanity (26).

If dependent origination reveals that no actor exists in isolation, then diplomacy conducted on the basis of narrow self-interest is not just ineffective; it is a fundamental misreading of reality itself. If interdependence is the fundamental nature of reality, then diplomacy must be grounded in the ethical framework that reflects that truth. At the heart of Buddhist ethics then is *Sila* or moral restraint. When they are applied to diplomacy, they are grounded in moral integrity, refraining from aggression while promoting forgiveness, reconciliation, and equality. The most practicable approach to integrating ethical framework to diplomacy is *Pancasila* five principles of peaceful coexistence. Diplomacy grounded in this ethical foundation offers a direct corrective to the failures of coercive diplomacy.

## **Pancasila as ethical frame to conduct of diplomacy**

Panchsheel also called the five precepts are ethical principles for individuals to uphold in Buddhism. The application of those Silas through a two level structure first among diplomats, at individual level, especially in the conduct of diplomacy, helps foster peace and harmony among their interactions, as it is often argued that war begins in the minds of men and that it is in the minds of diplomats that peace must be constructed. The practice of Panchsheel will not only limit desire for war or killings but also not allow for such desire to arise (Phanit 3).

Then with in the domain of state level, Within the domains of IR, Panchsheel as a way of conduct of diplomacy at policy level, would enhance world peace and security. Pancasila as the basis for international relations was first proposed by Indonesia President Dr. Sukarno as Pancasila, which include principles of nationalism, humanism, freedom, social justice and faith in god (Sanghani). In between, the Indian Prime Minister Nehru further explained these concepts in his speech in Colombo, referencing Indonesia. Later, the Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai proposed and endorsed the Panchsheel in the Sino-India agreement. Under the Cold War context, with a landmark moment at 1955 Bandung Conference, these principles were formally recognized as the guiding parameters for relations among newly independent states. Here, Panchsheel was contextualized as the 5 Principles of peaceful coexistence that promote reciprocal respect or sovereignty, non- aggression, non-interference in domestic affairs, equality, mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence among states, which had a major impact.

The application of these Sila or moral restraints can be applied to as a solution to coercive diplomatic practices that is prevalent. These Silas are also useful in negotiating frameworks that recognize the importance of shared values, on long-term gains over short-term gains. While both the principles or Panchsheel and 5 principles of peaceful coexistence prioritize ethical behavior, respect, harmony, and peaceful coexistence, one applies to social and personal ethics, and the other applies to state-to-state interactions or diplomacy. They are both linked to and aimed at realizing honesty and global harmony through nonviolent collaboration, reciprocal sustainable progress, the prevention of conflict and hostility, acceptance, and benevolence.

## **Linking Panchsheel into the Practice of Diplomacy**

### **1. Non-Violence – Mutual Non- Aggression**

When coercive diplomacy normalizes military threats as legitimate negotiation tools, accelerating global conflicts, non-violence rejects this logic entirely. At an individual level this first Sila of non-violence demands that diplomats enter negotiation without

the intent to dominate but to seek common ground. At state level this translates into mutual non-aggression, a commitment that disputes and differences be resolved through dialogue rather than force. The 1954 Sino-Indian agreement, which was the first formal adoption of Panchsheel (Sanghani), demonstrated that even historically rival states could commit to non-aggression as a diplomatic foundation without coercive intent.

## **2. Truthfulness- Respect for Sovereignty**

Where coercive diplomacy creates trust deficit with chaotic mixed signals and hidden agendas, the second Sila of truthfulness offers a corrective. The Buddhist principle of truthfulness at individual level demands that diplomats engage with their counterparts with honesty, transparency in their international dealings, at state level, this translates to a genuine respect to other state's independence and sovereignty to create a foundation for collaboration and long-term stability in international relations. A recent engagement between Bhutan and China in 2026, despite the absence of formal diplomatic relations, exemplifies that honest and transparent engagement can create diplomatic movement (Staff) even where institutional frameworks are absent.

## **3. Non- Stealing – Non-Interference**

When coercive diplomacy has justified military intervention under the banner of democratic promotion from Iraq to Afghanistan, has systematically violated the foundational diplomatic norm of non- interference. These interventions, that were driven by Military industrial complex and the coercive logic, led to destabilization of fragile state institutions. The war in Iraq resulted in approximately 4,500 US military fatalities with over 100, 000 Iraqi civilian deaths and an estimated financial cost of \$4.5 trillion dollars including the cost of funding the military operations (Downes and Monten) and yet eroded the American diplomatic credibility in the region. The Buddhist principle of non-stealing translates directly into this context. At the individual level, it demands that diplomats enter negotiations without the hidden agenda of reshaping another state's internal politics or imposing their own system of governance. At the state level, it demands unconditional respect for territorial integrity and political independence not as a diplomatic courtesy but as an ontological recognition of another state's sovereignty.

## **4. Non- sexual abuse; ethical restraint - Mutual Benefit**

Where the military- industrial complex has exploited its influence capability to extract profit through favorable policy at the expense of international peace, diplomacy becomes a means of exploitation through power asymmetry between actors. The Buddhist principle underlying this precept is not merely about personal conduct but

about the ethical obligation to refrain from exploiting power asymmetries in any relationship. At the individual level, this demands that diplomats enter negotiations without leveraging the vulnerability or weakness of the other party to extract disproportionate gains. At the state level, it requires that diplomatic engagements serve all parties equitably rather than becoming transactional exchanges that benefit the powerful at the expense of the weak. The Buddhist principle of abstaining from sexual misconduct is analogous to the promotion of equality and mutual benefits among nations, states must also engage with each other in an equitable way that serves the interests of all the parties. The American arms sales to the Gulf were justified under the rhetoric of regional stability. While these enormous transactions served in the defense industry, profits fueled conflicts in the region. Diplomacy grounded in mutual benefits instead measures the success of agreement not by whatone party extracted but by win-win strategies to both.

### **5. Mindfulness – Peaceful Coexistence**

Where coercive diplomacy has been defined by reactive aggression, short-term material gains, and zero-sum thinking, it has consistently failed to produce sustainable peace. If war begins in the mind, then the transformation of diplomacy must also begin there. The Buddhist principle of mindfulness demands precisely this not as passive contemplation but as an active diplomatic discipline. At the individual level, mindfulness demands that diplomats cultivate the capacity to step back from reactive, ego-driven impulses in negotiation, at the state level, mindfulness translates into prioritizing long-term peaceful coexistence over short-term aggressive expansion or momentary fulfillment of interest, recognizing that sustainable progress cannot be built on the defeat or expense of others but only on their willing cooperation.

## **Conclusion**

Contemporary diplomacy the necessary instrument through which states communicate, negotiate, and mitigate conflict in a complex interdependent world is failing. This paper has argued that its failure is not incidental but ontological. The actors involved in diplomatic processes treat negotiation as a momentary fulfillment of narrow interest, while non-state actors like the military-industrial complex actively incentivize states toward coercive choices. When negotiation does occur, it reflects business-minded transnationalism rather than genuine pursuit of peace producing the repeated negotiation failures this paper has documented.

The Buddhist doctrine of *Pratītyasamutpāda* dismantles the premise that makes this failure inevitable. No actor can obtain victory at the expense of another without that victory eventually consuming itself because nothing exists in isolation. The zero-sum, interest-based basis of contemporary diplomacy is not just ineffective

but a fundamental misreading of the nature of reality. When states and diplomats begin from this ontological understanding, the pursuit of another's harm becomes recognizable as the pursuit of one's own harm.

It is from this foundation that Panchsheel derives its diplomatic relevance. Each of its five principles - non-violence, truthfulness, non-interference, mutual benefit, and mindfulness offers a concrete corrective to a specific failure of coercive diplomacy. Applied at both the individual level of diplomatic conduct and the state level of foreign policy, these principles are positioned not to abandon diplomacy but to recover it to return diplomacy to what it was always meant to be: a practice of sustainable peace rather than an instrument of power.

The oxymoron of peace through strength has dominated diplomatic discourse. A diplomacy grounded in interdependence rather than isolation, in mutual responsibility rather than self-interest, and in mindfulness rather than reactive coercion offers a historically grounded and philosophically coherent alternative. The evidence of diplomatic failure makes this orientation undeniable.

## Works Cited

- Alrebh, Abdullah F. "The Performance of Maximum Pressure: Coercive Diplomacy and the Oman Opening." *Al Arabiya English*, 12 Feb. 2026, english.alarabiya.net/views/2026/02/12/the-performance-of-maximum-pressure-coercive-diplomacy-and-the-oman-opening.
- Alter, Eric, and Nickoly Mladenov. "Is Diplomacy Doomed?" *The Washington Institute*, 2024, www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/diplomacy-doomed.
- Cohen, Roger. "Diplomacy Is Dead." *The New York Times*, 21 Jan. 2013, www.nytimes.com/2013/01/22/opinion/global/roger-cohen-diplomacy-is-dead.html.
- Constantinou, Costas M., et al. *The SAGE Handbook of Diplomacy*. SAGE Publications Ltd, 2016, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473957930>.
- Downes, Alexander B., and Jonathan Monten. "Why Foreign-Imposed Regime Change Is Rarely a Path to Democracy." *Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs*, Harvard Kennedy School, 1 Sept. 2012, www.belfercenter.org/publication/why-foreign-imposed-regime-change-rarely-path-democracy.
- Ebegbulem, Joseph, and John Adams. "The Role of Diplomacy in International Dispute Resolution." *Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 10, no. 7, 2022, pp. 57-64, www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Role-of-Diplomacy.pdf.
- Institute for Economics and Peace. *Global Peace Index 2025*. 2025, www.economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/GPI-2025-web.pdf.
- King, Desmond, and Patrick Le Galès. *Reconfiguring European States in Crisis*. Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Kulaba, Moses. *Why Growing Influence of Non-State Actors in Diplomacy and Consular Practice Is a Cause for Alarm in Smooth Running of State Foreign Affairs*. 2019, [gepc.or.tz/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Role-and-growing-influence-of-Non-State-Actors-in-Diplomacy.pdf](http://gepc.or.tz/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Role-and-growing-influence-of-Non-State-Actors-in-Diplomacy.pdf).
- Long, William J. *A Buddhist Approach to International Relations: Radical Interdependence*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2021.
- Marshall, Shana. "The Defense Industry's Role in Militarizing US Foreign Policy." *Middle East Research and Information Project*, 15 June 2020, www.merip.org/2020/06/the-defense-industrys-role-in-militarizing-us-foreign-policy/.
- Oğurlu, Ebru. *Understanding the Distinguishing Features of Post-Westphalian Diplomacy*. 2019, [dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/906933](http://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/906933).
- Phanit, Thakur. *How to Promote World Peace: The Buddhist Way*. 2023, image.mfa.

go.th/mfa/0/4OJCTby7gE/Points\_of\_View/1-2023\_Feb2023\_World\_Peace\_Buddhist\_Way\_Thakur.pdf.

Rapnouil, Manuel Lafont. "The Brutalization of Diplomacy?" *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 19, no. 4, Oct. 2024, pp. 726–36, <https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191x-20241542>.

Rathbun, Brian C. "The Value and Values of Diplomacy." *Cornell University Press EBooks*, Oct. 2014, pp. 1-21, <https://doi.org/10.7591/9780801455063-002>.

Saaida, Mohammed. "Exploring the Dynamics of Complex Interdependence in International Relations." *ResearchGate*, vol. 1, no. 1, Jan. 2024, pp. 1-7, [www.researchgate.net/publication/377178987](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/377178987).

Sanghani, Yashvi. "The Guiding Principle of Peace: Panchsheel." *International Journal of Law Management and Humanities*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1000/IJLMH.112565>.

Scarazzato, Lorenzo, et al. "SIPRI Fact Sheet: Top 100 Arms-Producing Companies 2024." *SIPRI*, 2025, [www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2025-11/fs\\_2512\\_top\\_100\\_2024.pdf](http://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2025-11/fs_2512_top_100_2024.pdf).

SIPRI. "Unprecedented Rise in Global Military Expenditure as European and Middle East Spending Surges." *SIPRI*, 2025, [www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2025/unprecedented-rise-global-military-expenditure-european-and-middle-east-spending-surges](http://www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2025/unprecedented-rise-global-military-expenditure-european-and-middle-east-spending-surges).

Siriwardana, L. G. Dilini Tharika. "New Dynamics in Foreign Affairs: Failure of Diplomacy in 21st Century." *Sri Lanka Journal of International Relations*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2024.

Staff, The Wire. "Bhutan, China Agree to 'Maintain Momentum' of Boundary Negotiations." *The Wire*, Apr. 2026, [thewire.in/south-asia/bhutan-china-agree-to-maintain-momentum-of-boundary-negotiations](http://thewire.in/south-asia/bhutan-china-agree-to-maintain-momentum-of-boundary-negotiations).

Stepansky, Joseph. "'Remote Coercion': What Has US Approach Been since Abduction of Maduro?" *Al Jazeera*, 24 Jan. 2026, [www.aljazeera.com/news/2026/1/24/remote-coercion-what-has-us-approach-been-since-abduction-of-maduro](http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2026/1/24/remote-coercion-what-has-us-approach-been-since-abduction-of-maduro).

Thapa, Sunil, and Pramila Bakhati. "From Philosophy to Practice: Buddha's Panchsheel in the Modern Diplomatic Arsenal of Small States." *Global Academic Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2024, pp. 159–66, <https://doi.org/10.36348/gajhss.2024.v06i04.003>.

Türkcan, Muhammed. "The (In)Effectiveness of Coercive Diplomacy: The US Maximum Pressure Campaign on Iran." TRT World Research Centre, 2019, [researchcentre.trtworld.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/The-InEffectiveness-of-Coercive-Diplomacy.pdf](http://researchcentre.trtworld.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/The-InEffectiveness-of-Coercive-Diplomacy.pdf).

Vittori, Jodi. "A Mutual Extortion Racket: The Military Industrial Complex and

US Foreign Policy-The Cases of Saudi Arabia and UAE." *Transparency International Defence and Security*, 2019, [ti-defence.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/US\\_Defense\\_Industry\\_Influence\\_Paper\\_v4\\_digital\\_singlePage.pdf](https://ti-defence.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/US_Defense_Industry_Influence_Paper_v4_digital_singlePage.pdf).

Walker, Ronald A. *Multilateral Conferences: Purposeful International Negotiation*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Wang, Miao. *Power under the Shadow: The Dual Impact of the U.S. Military-Industrial Complex*. 2024, <https://doi.org/10.12414/jiegg.240300>.

Wiseman, Geoffrey, and Paul Sharp, editors. *The Diplomatic Corps as an Institution of International Society*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.