

# American Journal of International Relations (AJIR)



## The Swinging Pendulum of the Game Nations Play in International Relations: A Duplicity Diplomacy

*Christian C. Madubuko, PhD., MA, BA; Dip.*



## The Swinging Pendulum of the Game Nations Play in International Relations: A Duplicity Diplomacy



Christian C. Madubuko, PhD., MA, BA; Dip.<sup>1\*</sup>

School of Regulation and Global Governance, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT



### Article history

*Submitted 29.09.2024 Revised Version Received 03.11.2024 Accepted 03.12.2024*

### Abstract

**Purpose:** This paper endeavours to critically interrogate the concept of "duplicity diplomacy," positing it as an essential framework for understanding the oscillating strategies employed by states amidst the complexities of contemporary international relations. The aim is to unveil the inherent contradictions and strategic necessities that underlie this phenomenon, particularly in the context of an increasingly multipolar global landscape.

**Materials and Methods:** The research employs a qualitative methodology that integrates a multi-faceted analysis of empirical case studies involving significant geopolitical players. This approach encompasses semi-structured interviews with seasoned diplomats to capture experiential insights, a comprehensive content analysis of diplomatic communications to identify patterns and nuances in language and intent, as well as systematic reviews of contemporaneous media portrayals to contextualize public perceptions. By triangulating these methods, the study aims to enrich the understanding of duplicity in statecraft.

**Findings:** The findings indicate that duplicity diplomacy transcends a mere catalogue of deceit, emerging as a strategic necessity reflective of the intricate complexities and contradictions that characterize our current multipolar world.

Empirical illustrations reveal how states frequently oscillate between cooperative rhetoric and competitive actions, engaging in ostensible displays of loyalty while simultaneously pursuing self-interested goals through subterfuge. Notably, instances of strategic alliances undermined by covert operations serve to illustrate the double-edged nature of duplicity, where short-term gains often precipitate long-term repercussions that undermine international trust and stability.

**Implications to Theory, Practice and Policy:** The analysis raises substantial questions regarding the ethical frameworks governing diplomatic practice in the context of growing global interdependence. It posits that as the stakes of international interactions escalate, the propensity for duplicity in state behaviour is likely to intensify, necessitating a critical re-evaluation of both scholarly and practical approaches to diplomacy. This discourse invites policymakers and scholars alike to consider how established norms around transparency and accountability can be reconciled with the inherent contradictions of statecraft.

**Keywords:** *Duplicity Diplomacy D20, International Relations D50, Realism D23, Constructivism D24, Geopolitics D16, Power Dynamics D19*

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

In an era characterized by unprecedented interconnectedness and complexity, the study of duplicity in international relations has emerged as a pivotal focus for scholarly inquiry (Mearsheimer, 2014; Jentleson & Whytock, 2005). As states navigate a shifting geopolitical landscape marked by competing interests, the concept of duplicity becomes increasingly salient for understanding state behaviour. Duplicity, defined as the simultaneous cultivation of amiable relationships and the pursuit of self-serving agendas, illuminates the intricate realities of global politics and highlights the inherent contradictions in state behaviour (Krastev & Holmes, 2019). This duality complicates diplomatic interactions and raises pressing questions regarding accountability, trust, and the ethical dimensions of international relations.

The objective of this article is to delve into the multifaceted concept of duplicity diplomacy within the domain of diplomatic relations among nation-states. Through an exploration of how states strategically employ duplicity, this article seeks to elucidate the mechanisms and consequences of this practice, mapping its extensive impact on the broader international political landscape. As states engage in a delicate balancing act, the motives and operational strategies underpinning duplicity can significantly influence both bilateral and multilateral relationships, instigating ripples that affect the fabric of international order (Lake, 2018; Sidaway, 2014).

To adequately frame the analysis of duplicity, it is essential to define key terms and concepts. "Duplicity diplomacy" refers to a phenomenon wherein states adopt ostensibly cooperative behaviours while simultaneously maintaining concealed agendas that often contradict their public positions (Friedman, 2016; Hawthorne, 2021). This duality is not merely a tactical choice but rather reflects a deeper structural condition of the international system marked by anarchy, power asymmetries, and competing national interests (Waltz, 1979). The state's commitment to a diplomacy characterized by duplicity can be seen as a reflection of its strategic calculus, revealing the tensions between idealist aspirations for cooperation and realist imperatives for survival.

Furthermore, "strategic ambiguity," a term critical to understanding duplicity, denotes the intentional vagueness with which states obscure their true intentions in diplomatic communications. This approach can be conceptually differentiated from outright deception; strategic ambiguity is designed to create space for multiple interpretations, thereby allowing states to navigate complex geopolitical environments (Kern, 2020). Historical instances of strategic ambiguity, such as the U.S. policy towards Taiwan, illustrate how states utilize this tactic to maintain flexibility in response to adversarial challenges (Shirk, 2007). This calculus permits states to neither fully commit to a specific course of action nor reveal their hand to adversaries, thereby serving vital national interests while potentially avoiding escalatory confrontations.

The practice of strategic ambiguity is often grounded in theories of deterrence and assurance, encapsulating a delicate balancing act that acknowledges both the potential for coercive diplomacy and the necessity of maintaining credibility (Nitze, 1981; Morgan, 2003). It enables states to project an image of resolve while simultaneously providing an off-ramp for diplomacy, complicating adversarial calculations and potentially fostering unintended consequences in the diplomatic arena.

This paper is structured as follows: initially, a literature review will provide an overview of existing scholarship on duplicity in international relations, framing the discourse within broader theoretical contexts such as realism, constructivism, and post-structuralism. Next, the

methodology section will outline the qualitative approach employed in the study, including case selection criteria and data collection methods. Selected case studies will be analysed to explore the practical manifestations of duplicity diplomacy across different geopolitical contexts. Finally, the paper will synthesize key findings, discuss implications for international relations theory and practice, and propose avenues for future research. By undertaking this exploration, the article aims to foster a deeper understanding of the role duplicity plays in shaping diplomatic practices and international outcomes.

### **Context**

To enhance the discourse on duplicity in international relations, particularly through the lens of the Cold War, it is crucial to ground the analysis in specific historical instances that illuminate the intricate dynamics of espionage and strategic deception employed by both the United States and the Soviet Union. This period serves as an exceptional tableau for examining how duplicity manifests in statecraft, reflecting not only the tactics employed but also the broader geopolitical motivations that drive such behaviour.

One quintessential example of duplicity during the Cold War was the extensive espionage operations orchestrated by the United States through the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). The Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961 epitomizes this duplicity, as it was conducted under a veil of secrecy with the aim of overthrowing the Cuban regime led by Fidel Castro. The operation not only illustrates the reliance on covert military intervention but also underscores the broader theme of misrepresentation that permeated U.S. foreign policy at the time. The planning stages were shrouded in deception, as the true objectives were obscured from both Congress and the American public. The disastrous outcome further highlights the risks associated with duplicitous tactics, raising philosophical questions about the ethical implications of state-sponsored deception.

Conversely, the Soviet Union adeptly utilized misinformation strategies to shape both domestic and international perceptions. A notable instance is Operation INFEKTION, a disinformation campaign propagated throughout the 1980s, which posited that the United States had engineered the HIV/AIDS virus as a bioweapon. This orchestrated narrative exemplifies how the Soviet regime leveraged psychological tactics to further its propaganda goals, manipulating public discourse to sow discord and distrust toward the West. The operation not only reflected a sophisticated understanding of media influence but also illustrates the profound impact that state-sponsored misinformation can have on international relations, as it contributed to a climate of paranoia and suspicion.

The Cold War also witnessed a complex interplay of alliances that underscored the duplicity prevalent in diplomatic relations. The United States, in its bid to counter Soviet influence, frequently aligned itself with authoritarian regimes under the pretense of advancing democracy and human rights. The support for Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet, for example, underscores a significant moral contradiction in U.S. foreign policy. While advocating for democracy, the U.S. tacitly endorsed and even assisted a regime characterized by human rights abuses to promote its strategic interests. This dichotomy reflects a fundamental tension inherent in interstate relations where duplicity becomes a necessary tool to navigate competing geopolitical objectives.

Additionally, the Vietnam War serves as a poignant example of duplicity through its nexus of deception and strategic framing. The Gulf of Tonkin incident, which purportedly involved unprovoked attacks on U.S. naval vessels, was leveraged to justify deeper U.S. military involvement in Vietnam. Subsequent investigations revealed that the events were misrepresented, raising critical questions about the integrity of information presented to

Congress and the American public. The manipulation of intelligence to galvanize public support for the war epitomizes the complexities of duplicity in democratic states, where the imperatives of national security often clash with the need for transparency and ethical governance.

In conclusion, the Cold War provides a rich historical context for understanding the multifaceted nature of duplicity in international relations. Through specific examples of espionage, misinformation, and strategic alliances, it becomes evident that duplicity is not merely a tactical manoeuvre but rather a complex interplay of ethical, political, and psychological dimensions. Incorporating these nuanced historical instances not only strengthens the conceptual framework surrounding duplicity but also enhances our comprehension of its enduring presence in contemporary diplomatic practices, reflecting the intricate web of motivations that continue to shape state behaviour on the global stage.

### **Globalization and Interdependence**

Globalization has engendered a profound transformation in the dynamics of international relations, fostering increased economic interdependence among states. Scholars such as Keohane and Nye (1977) emphasize that this interdependence compels states to engage in cooperative endeavours, giving rise to intricate webs of trade agreements, multilateral institutions, and regulatory frameworks aimed at promoting mutual benefit and addressing transnational challenges. As states become intricately linked through these cooperative arrangements, there emerges a dual dynamic of interdependence that affords not only opportunities for collaboration but also vulnerabilities that can lead to duplicity.

While it is valid to assert that interdependence creates fertile ground for duplicity, particularly as states grapple with competing national interests (Mearsheimer, 2001), it is essential to explore the counter-narrative: the potential for increased transparency that accompanies deeper interconnections. The very nature of globalization necessitates a higher degree of accountability, as states must often disclose economic data, regulatory practices, and environmental standards to facilitate trade and investment flows. This transparency is not just a byproduct but a critical component of successful international agreements and, consequently, is reinforced through international institutions like the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Moreover, the concept of “soft power,” articulated by Joseph Nye (2004), further underscores the role of interdependence in fostering transparency and cooperation. Nations that successfully project their cultural and political values alongside their economic interests can enhance their diplomatic leverage, which in turn obligates them to uphold norms of transparency and collective action. This dynamic illustrates how states might pursue strategic interests not solely through duplicity but also via engagement in creative diplomacy and multilateral initiatives that seek to address global issues.

On a broader scale, the “networked economy” model proposed by scholars like Castells (1996) indicates that economic interdependence in a globalized world facilitates networks of communication and collaboration that transcend traditional power hierarchies. Through these networks, states and non-state actors can share information and resources, which serves as a deterrent against duplicity. Collaborative platforms - whether they be in climate science, public health, or trade regulation - demand transparency and commitment to collective norms, thus reinforcing the interdependence that can steer states toward cooperation rather than competition.

In summary, while the literature emphasizes the propensity for duplicity within the context of globalization (Mearsheimer, 2001), it is equally crucial to consider the counterbalancing forces

of transparency and cooperation that the framework of interdependence fosters. This duality allows for a more nuanced understanding of globalization's impact on international relations; rather than viewing it solely as a catalyst for self-serving actions, we can appreciate it as a complex arena where enhanced interdependence may also facilitate greater transparency and collaborative problem-solving among nations. Thus, the interplay of cooperation and self-interest in the global arena reflects a sophisticated web of interactions that warrants further scholarly inquiry.

### **Multipolarity and Shifting Power Dynamics**

The transition from a unipolar to a multipolar world order has engendered a significant reconfiguration of power dynamics, compelling states to adapt their foreign policies in response to emerging challenges and opportunities. This evolving landscape has been analysed through the lens of realist theories, which emphasize the importance of power and self-interest in state interactions (Waltz, 1979). The emergence of new actors, particularly non-Western powers, necessitates the employment of sophisticated diplomatic strategies, including duplicity. For instance, states may publicly ally with international norms while clandestinely undermining them to secure strategic advantages. This duality is often evident in contemporary geopolitical conflicts, where states leverage duplicity to navigate complex inter-state relationships, enhancing their bargaining positions and asserting influence in a fragmented global landscape.

### **Technological Advances and Information Warfare**

The digital revolution has fundamentally transformed the mechanisms of diplomacy and statecraft, as illuminated by scholars such as Castells (2009). The proliferation of information technology has not only accelerated the spread of narratives but has also redefined the parameters of influence and perception management in the international arena. This transformation enables states to effectively engage in information warfare, which operates alongside and often intermingles with traditional diplomatic practices. The capacity to manipulate narratives and disseminate disinformation facilitates a new form of duplicity, allowing states to obscure their intentions while advancing covert objectives (Benkler, 2016). This duality in strategy allows for plausible deniability - a concept crucial to the preservation of state interests - ultimately complicating the attribution of deceit and undermining accountability within international relations.

In this context, it becomes imperative to expand the discourse surrounding state-sponsored duplicity to encompass cyber-attacks as a significant manifestation of information warfare. Cyber operations represent an evolution of traditional warfare modalities, wherein technological innovation allows states to conduct clandestine assaults on the digital infrastructure of adversaries without the need for overt military engagement. As noted by Nye (2010), the intersection of cyber capabilities and information warfare presents a multifaceted security challenge exacerbated by the anonymity afforded by digital environments. Cyber-attacks can be strategically executed to disrupt critical infrastructure, manipulate electoral processes, or disseminate misinformation - all while enabling governments to assert plausible deniability regarding their involvement.

Moreover, these cyber incursions are not isolated events but part of a broader strategy that reshapes geopolitical dynamics. For instance, the categorization of cyber operations as acts of war varies significantly between state actors, leading to a convoluted landscape of international norms concerning cyber behaviour. As Michael Fischerkeller and Richard Harknett (2017) argue, the integration of cyber capabilities into military strategy necessitates a re-evaluation of existing frameworks of deterrence and escalation, as cyber-attacks often carry implications that are both immediate and long-term, making them a critical element of information warfare.

By incorporating cyber-attacks into the discussion of information warfare, we not only recognize the blurred lines between traditional military tactics and digital subterfuge but also acknowledge the complex socio-political repercussions of these actions. The intersection of cyber capabilities and information warfare emphasizes the pressing need for comprehensive strategies that address the evolving nature of state-sponsored duplicity. This includes the establishment of robust international norms and cooperative mechanisms aimed at mitigating the risks posed by both misinformation and incoming cyber threats, which are increasingly integral to modern geopolitical contests. Such a nuanced understanding is essential for researchers and policymakers alike as they navigate the complexities of contemporary statecraft in an information-saturated and digital world.

### **Historical Precedents and Lessons Learned**

A thorough investigation of historical precedents serves to contextualize contemporary duplicity within a historical framework of diplomatic practice. Events such as the Treaty of Versailles and the secret negotiations that characterized World War II reveal the enduring presence of duplicity in international politics (Trachtenberg, 2006). The Cold War era, marked by intense ideological confrontation and covert operations, provides further illustration of the complexities surrounding duplicity; states often engaged in strategic deception to bolster their advantages while masking hostile intentions. This historical lens not only aids in understanding the persistence of duplicity but also compels current scholars and practitioners to analyse the long-term implications of such diplomatic behaviours on international trust and collaboration.

### **Ethical Implications and Normative Challenges**

The proliferation of duplicity in international diplomacy raises critical ethical concerns regarding the integrity of state interactions. Normative theories in international relations, particularly constructivist perspectives, contend that trust and legitimacy are cornerstones of cooperative diplomacy (Wendt, 1999). The blatant use of duplicity threatens these principles, resulting in a decline of mutual trust among nations. Moreover, the normalization of deceptive practices in diplomacy may lead to the erosion of established international norms and frameworks, posing significant challenges to collective action on global issues, such as climate change and security. As states grapple with these ethical dilemmas, the discourse on duplicity prompts a re-evaluation of the principles guiding state behaviour, ultimately necessitating a recommitment to transparency and accountability in international relations.

In sum, the contextual underpinnings of duplicity in international relations are framed by the forces of globalization, the evolution of multipolar power dynamics, technological advances in information dissemination, and historical lessons. By situating duplicity within this comprehensive framework, the analysis reveals the complex interplay of motivations and consequences associated with deceptive diplomatic practices. This multifaceted understanding is crucial for further exploring how duplicity influences state interactions and shapes the global political landscape.

### **Problem Statement**

The phenomenon of duplicity in international relations has emerged as a pressing issue that warrants rigorous scholarly examination, not only for its implications for statecraft but also for the ethical frameworks governing international interactions. The prevalence of duplicitous behaviour - characterized by strategic deception, misinformation, and manipulation—poses critical challenges to the foundational principles of trust, accountability, and cooperative governance that underpin global diplomacy. This problem statement delineates the dimensions and consequences of duplicity, underscoring the urgent need for a comprehensive investigation

into its ramifications on both state behaviour and international stability. Flowing from this, therefore, the problem statement raises the following concerns:

**Erosion of Trust among States:** The operationalization of duplicity undermines the bedrock of trust that is essential for diplomatic engagement. Trust is critical in facilitating negotiations and fostering collaborative efforts among states (Lewicki et al., 2006). According to social constructivist theories, the absence of mutual trust can lead to a spiral of distrust, where states become increasingly suspicious of each other's motives (Wendt, 1999). This erosion complicates diplomatic dialogue, as states may resort to pre-emptive strategies and defensive postures, ultimately destabilizing regional and global security.

**Implications for Global Governance and Multilateralism:** The strategic adoption of duplicity by states raises fundamental questions about the integrity and efficacy of global governance mechanisms. When states enter agreements or partnerships with hidden agendas, the legitimacy of international institutions is called into question (Dreiling & Wolf, 2001). This behaviour can lead to selective compliance with international norms and obligations, undermining cooperative efforts to address pressing global challenges such as climate change, health pandemics, and transnational terrorism (Börzel & Risse, 2005). The proliferation of duplicitous behaviour endangers the normative framework of international law and complicates the capacity for collective action.

**Challenges to Attribution and Accountability:** Duplicity creates intricate dilemmas regarding attribution of responsibility for actions undertaken by states. The ambiguity inherent in duplicitous tactics hampers the ability of other states and international organizations to ascertain accountability for breaches of international law (Tallman, 2018). The lack of clear evidence complicates punitive actions against rogue states and detracts from the normative imperative of accountability that is central to a rules-based international order.

**Strategic Calculus and Long-term Consequences:** The integration of duplicity into diplomatic strategy invites scrutiny into the strategic motivations that underlie such behaviour. While duplicitous actions may yield immediate benefits, they often carry significant long-term costs, including reputational damage and the potential for diplomatic isolation (Brinkley, 2002). The divergence between short-term strategic gains and long-term diplomatic relationships necessitates a critical examination of how states rationalize the use of duplicity as a legitimate tool of statecraft, revealing the broader implications for international relations theory and practice.

**Ethical Considerations and Normative Frameworks:** From an ethical standpoint, the normalization of duplicity poses significant challenges. The genealogical study of diplomatic ethics, as articulated by theorists such as Carr and Walzer, demands a critical reevaluation of the moral imperatives governing state conduct. Carr (1964) notably underscores the ethical dilemmas inherent in political realism, where the pursuit of power often eclipses moral considerations. Walzer (1977), on the other hand, advocates for a just war theory that emphasizes the moral constraints on state behaviour, thereby challenging the acceptability of duplicity.

Engaging with these theoretical positions invites a broader inquiry into the moral responsibilities of states. The risks associated with the normalization of duplicity, particularly its potential to diminish the ethical foundations of diplomacy, necessitate a rigorous ethical framework that accounts for accountability, transparency, and mutual trust. This raises profound questions about the legitimacy of actions taken under the guise of national interest and the broader humanitarian implications of such practices.



## **Interdisciplinary Perspective**

The confluence of political science, ethics, and international law requires an interdisciplinary inquiry into the nature of duplicity in international relations. Incorporating legal perspectives enables a critical examination of how international law seeks to regulate state behaviour and the challenges posed by duplicity in upholding these standards. The interplay between ethical imperatives and legal frameworks provides insights into the mechanisms that can promote transparency and accountability in diplomatic engagements.

This research endeavours to contribute meaningfully to the existing literature on diplomatic practices by elucidating the complex interrelationships between duplicity and international stability. By situating the analysis within both realism and constructivism, the study aims to underscore that addressing the challenges posed by duplicity is not merely a theoretical exercise but a practical imperative for fostering a more ethical and accountable system of global diplomacy. In doing so, it seeks to outline pathways for redefining diplomatic engagement in an era marked by heightened interdependence and geopolitical rivalries, calling for renewed commitments to ethical governance that resonate with both theoretical insights and pragmatic realities.

## **Theoretical Frameworks: Realism and Constructivism**

Realism operates on the premise that states are rational actors motivated primarily by national interests, power dynamics, and the anarchic nature of the international system. This perspective suggests that duplicity, or the strategic manipulation of truth, can be perceived as a pragmatic response to external threats, emphasizing the necessity for states to protect their interests. However, realism's applicability in contemporary international relations is challenged by the increasing importance of norms, values, and interdependence among states.

The constructivist approach provides a counterpoint by focusing on the socially constructed nature of international norms and the intersubjective understanding that shapes state interactions. Constructivism posits that duplicity can alter the normative landscape, influencing states' perceptions of trust and reliability. By examining international norms concerning transparency, accountability, and ethical diplomacy, constructivism facilitates a nuanced understanding of how duplicity can be both a symptom and a catalyst for broader shifts in ethical engagement among states.

This duality creates a fertile ground for exploring the complexities inherent in diplomatic relations. While realism may justify the use of duplicity under certain strategic conditions, constructivism probes the long-term implications of such practices for diplomatic legitimacy and the ethical commitments of states. As noted by scholars such as Wendt (1999), the social construction of reality in international relations is crucial for understanding the dynamics of state behaviour, necessitating a closer examination of how duplicity interacts with established norms and ethical frameworks.

## **Realism: Power Politics and Self-Interest**

At the heart of realist theory lie foundational principles articulated by key scholars, including Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz, who assert the primacy of the state in an anarchic international system characterized by a lack of overarching authority. Central to realism is the notion that states are rational actors whose behaviour is predominantly driven by the imperatives of national interest, particularly security and power (Morgenthau, 1948).

Realism posits that in a world where power dynamics continuously fluctuate, states inevitably engage in behaviour aimed at maximizing their relative power to ensure survival. In this context, duplicity becomes not merely a tool but a rational choice for states navigating the

uncertainties inherent in international relations. As Mearsheimer (2001) articulates in his theory of Offensive Realism, states constantly seek to alter the balance of power to their advantage, which often requires obscuring their intentions or capabilities to mislead competitors.

The strategic calculus of states reinforces the utility of duplicity as a necessary evil. For instance, the concept of the "security dilemma" reveals the paradox where actions taken by one state to enhance its security can inadvertently threaten others, prompting a cycle of mistrust and defensive measures (Jervis, 1978). Within this framework, duplicity enables states to engage in strategic ambiguity, presenting a façade of cooperation while pursuing divergent interests. This tactic can be observed in historical contexts, such as Cold War diplomacy, where both superpowers engaged in misleading rhetoric and clandestine operations to gain leverage over one another.

Realism underscores the consequences of duplicity in evolving power relations. As states manipulate information to achieve strategic gains, they foster an environment of distrust and risk long-term diplomatic isolation and reputational damage. The cumulative effect of duplicity can lead to systemic instability, undermining the very structure of international cooperation and eroding the legitimacy of multilateral institutions that rely on mutual trust.

### **Constructivism: Identity, Norms and Social Constructs**

In contrast, constructivism offers a profound critique of the materialist assumptions of realism by introducing the significance of social constructs and the formative role of identity. Pioneered by scholars like Alexander Wendt and Martha Finnemore, constructivism asserts that state behaviour is profoundly influenced by the identities and norms that pervade the international system (Wendt, 1999). This perspective illuminates how duplicity is not merely a function of strategic self-interest but is also deeply intertwined with the narratives and expectations surrounding state behaviour.

Constructivist theorists contend that the identities of states - shaped by culture, history, and social interaction - play a crucial role in mediating their diplomatic choices. The tension between identity and duplicity raises important questions about the ethical implications of state actions. For example, a state that identifies as a promoter of democratic values may find itself in a paradoxical position when its diplomatic strategies involve elements of deception or betrayal. This dissonance can trigger internal legitimacy crises and external backlash, ultimately affecting the state's long-term standing in the international community.

Moreover, constructivism emphasizes the role of normative frameworks that govern international relations. Norms related to transparency, accountability, and ethical conduct serve as critical benchmarks against which state behaviour is evaluated. Duplicity, while sometimes serving immediate strategic goals, risks transgressing these established norms, resulting in reputational costs and diminishing the state's soft power. The ramifications of such transgressions can be profound; states that engage in duplicitous diplomacy may find themselves increasingly marginalized in global discourse, struggling to maintain their influence in a system that values consistency and reliability.

The constructivist critique further suggests that the interplay between identity, norms, and state behaviour is dynamic and subject to change. As the international landscape evolves, so too do the identities and normative frameworks that shape state interactions. The ascent of new powers and shifts in global governance necessitate a re-evaluation of how duplicity is perceived and sanctioned. In this context, states must navigate the often-treacherous waters of perception management, seeking to align their actions with both their self-imposed identities and the normative expectations of the international community.

## **Integrating Realism and Constructivism: A Nuanced Perspective on Duplicity in International Relations**

The examination of duplicity within the sphere of international relations necessitates a comprehensive approach that acknowledges the theoretical intersections between realism and constructivism. While these theories are often treated independently, their interplay significantly enriches our understanding of the complexities underlying state behaviour, especially concerning deceitful practices in diplomacy.

From a realist perspective, duplicity is often framed as a rational response to the anarchic nature of the international system, where states prioritize their national interests and survival. Realism posits that in a world characterized by power politics and competition, states may resort to duplicitous tactics as a calculated means to gain strategic advantage or ensure security. This perspective contextualizes duplicity within the framework of power dynamics, where moral considerations are frequently subordinated to pragmatic necessity. Notably, thinkers like Hans Morgenthau have contended that moral principles cannot be applied to the actions of states in their abstract universal form; instead, the realities of power and survival dictate that duplicity may be not only permissible but essential in the conduct of foreign affairs.

In contrast, constructivism foregrounds the role of social constructs, norms, and identities, adding an essential dimension to the analysis of duplicity. Constructivists assert that state behaviour is not solely determined by material interests but is significantly influenced by the shared beliefs and normative frameworks that shape international interactions. According to Alexander Wendt, "anarchy is what states make of it," suggesting that the nature of the international system is constructed through social processes and collective understandings. Within this context, duplicity can be understood as a reflection of the competing identities and perceptions of legitimacy that states navigate. For example, a state's engagement in duplicity may stem from the desire to align its actions with the expectations of its domestic audience or the broader international community, revealing the ethical underpinnings that inform state behaviour.

Integrating these theoretical frameworks allows for a more nuanced understanding of duplicity as a multifaceted phenomenon. Rather than viewing realism's focus on power dynamics and constructivism's emphasis on social context as mutually exclusive, we can recognize that state actions are often driven by both imperatives. A state may, therefore, engage in duplicitous behaviour not only to enhance its strategic position in the international arena but also to negotiate the intricate web of identities and norms that govern its diplomatic relations.

This synthesis reveals critical insights regarding the implications of duplicity for international cooperation, trust, and accountability. As states operate within a globalized environment where reputational considerations hold considerable weight, the interplay between realism and constructivism becomes especially salient. The potential for duplicity to undermine trust among states can lead to heightened uncertainty and insecurity, leading to a cyclical erosion of cooperation. Consequently, the challenge for policymakers lies in navigating these complex dynamics, balancing the strategic use of duplicity with the ethical imperatives that arise from normative expectations and collective identities.

In sum, by adopting an integrated analytical framework that considers both realist and constructivist perspectives, we enhance our theoretical rigor in understanding duplicity in international relations. This approach not only provides a clearer picture of the motivations and implications of duplicitous behaviour but also offers informed strategies for fostering transparency and mutual understanding in an increasingly interconnected world. Such a depth of analysis is imperative for scholars and practitioners alike, as it facilitates the development

of effective diplomatic strategies that account for both material and social realities in international engagements.

## 2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research methodology to rigorously interrogate the concept of "duplicity diplomacy" within the contours of contemporary international relations. Following a multi-layered approach, this inquiry utilizes empirical case studies featuring significant geopolitical actors, thereby ensuring a comprehensive exploration of the phenomenon (Yin, 2018).

To capture the experiential dimensions inherent in duplicity, the study integrates semi-structured interviews with seasoned diplomats and practitioners. This methodological choice enables the gathering of nuanced perspectives that reflect the complexities inherent to diplomatic practice (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). The design of these interviews is grounded in the principles of interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA), which prioritizes understanding the meaning-making processes of individuals within their social contexts.

Concurrently, a comprehensive content analysis of diplomatic communications - including treaties, position papers, and informal correspondence - is conducted to identify recurring patterns, themes, and linguistic nuances that illuminate the underlying strategic intentions and contradictions of duplicity diplomacy (Krippendorff, 2018). Within this framework, the discourse analysis is specifically informed by critical discourse analysis (CDA), drawing heavily on the theoretical constructs posited by scholars such as Norman Fairclough (1992) and Teun A. van Dijk (1998). This approach enables an exploration of the relationship between discourse, power, and ideology, thereby facilitating an understanding of how language serves not only as a tool for communication but also as an instrument of social control and ideological positioning.

The discourse analytical component will employ a multidimensional toolkit, including but not limited to:

**Discourse Markers:** Examining how diplomatic actors utilize specific linguistic markers to frame issues, manage tone, and construct relational dynamics with foreign entities.

**Framing Analysis:** Identifying how various diplomatic narratives are structured within broader frameworks that serve political ends, manipulating public perception and justifying state actions in the international arena.

**Narrative Structure:** Analysing the storylines that emerge within diplomatic texts, focusing on how these narratives facilitate the expression of duplicity, articulating contradictions between stated objectives and actual behaviours.

**Intertextuality:** Investigating how diplomatic texts reference, echo, or diverge from previous communications, thereby revealing layers of strategic continuity or divergence across time and context.

In conjunction with discourse analysis, systematic reviews of contemporaneous media portrayals will contextualize public perceptions regarding duplicity in state behaviour (Arora & Evans, 2018). The study will utilize a media framing analysis technique, as proposed by Entman (1993), to evaluate how narratives in the media influence perceptions of duplicity, thereby affecting diplomatic engagement and governmental policy formation (Cohen, 2020).

To ensure robustness and depth in the inquiry, the triangulation of qualitative methods - namely interviews, content analysis, and media reviews - will be employed (Denzin, 2017). This

methodological triangulation enhances the validity of findings by corroborating evidence across different data sources, while allowing for a richer exploration of the intricate interplay between normative expectations, strategic imperatives, and the ethical dilemmas faced by diplomatic actors.

Theoretical framing is situated within both constructivist and realist paradigms to provide a comprehensive analysis of duplicity within the sphere of international relations (Wendt, 1999; Mearsheimer, 2001). Constructivism elucidates the significance of social norms, identities, and discursive practices in shaping diplomatic behaviour, while realism foregrounds the enduring primacy of power and self-interest. This dual framework facilitates a nuanced understanding of how duplicity not only functions as a strategic necessity for states but also serves as a site of ideological contestation reflecting the complexities of international engagement.

Through this rigorous methodological approach, the research aims to make a significant contribution to the scholarly discourse surrounding duplicity diplomacy. By prompting a re-evaluation of established theoretical constructs and practical applications in international relations, it invites policymakers and scholars alike to critically engage with the ethical dimensions of diplomacy in an increasingly interdependent and complex global landscape.

### **Historical Context of Duplicity in Diplomacy**

The phenomenon of duplicity in diplomacy is deeply woven into the fabric of international relations, indicative of the complex interplay of strategic interests, power dynamics, and ideological rivalries. Through an examination of significant historical milestones, we can discern the manifestations of duplicity across various diplomatic contexts. This section will explore key historical cases - including the Cold War, colonialism, and the machinations of alliances and betrayals - while also engaging with their ethical implications and the influence they wield on the evolution of diplomacy and the shifting nature of international relationships.

### **Historical Cases of Duplicity**

#### **The Cold War: Deception as Strategy**

The Cold War (1947-1991) serves as a critical case study for understanding duplicity in diplomacy, characterized by the ideological dichotomy between Western capitalist powers, primarily led by the United States, and Eastern communist states, dominated by the Soviet Union. This period was marked not only by overt military posturing but also by a pervasive atmosphere of mistrust and subterfuge, wherein duplicity was often framed as a necessary instrument of statecraft.

One of the most salient examples of this duplicity can be found in U.S. interventions in Latin America, particularly during the Cuban Revolution of 1959. The Bay of Pigs Invasion in 1961 epitomizes this duplicity: publicly, the U.S. government professed its commitment to democracy and self-determination, while covertly orchestrating plans to unseat Fidel Castro (Schlesinger, 2004). This juxtaposition of rhetoric and action underscores the tension between professed democratic values and the Machiavellian realities of foreign policy, raising profound ethical concerns about the application of moral principles in statecraft.

Scholars such as Robert Jervis have articulated the concept of "the spiral model" in the context of warfare and diplomacy, wherein misperceptions and duplicity can exacerbate tensions and lead to conflict escalation (Jervis, 1976). The moral implications of these manoeuvres extend beyond immediate geopolitical outcomes; they contribute to a broader narrative of scepticism regarding the intentions of powerful states, particularly among nations in the Global South, who have long been subjected to the whims of superpower politics.

Conversely, the Soviet Union's employment of disinformation tactics solidified duplicity as a critical component of its diplomatic arsenal, with agencies like the KGB orchestrating "Active Measures" to manipulate public sentiment and destabilize Western democratic cohesion (Bacon, 2019). This diversionary strategy highlights the ethical dilemmas inherent in using deception as a tool of statecraft: while such tactics may yield short-term advantages, they inevitably erode public trust - even among allies - and contribute to an enduring climate of suspicion and discord.

### **Colonialism: The Justification of Exploitation**

The historical context of colonialism provides a profound lens through which to explore duplicity, as colonial powers frequently cloaked their imperial pursuits under the pretence of moral or civilizational missions. This paternalistic rhetoric, articulated by figures such as Rudyard Kipling in his notion of the "white man's burden," served to obscure the realities of systemic exploitation, oppression, and disenfranchisement experienced by colonized populations.

The Berlin Conference of 1884-1885 represents a pivotal moment in this narrative, as European nations partitioned Africa without African representation, framing the exercise of colonialism under the guise of a technological and civilizing mission (Hobsbawm, 1987). Ethically, this duplicity raises profound questions regarding the moral imperatives that justify territorial claims and resource extraction. The implications for human dignity and rights were systematically disregarded, engendering violent resistance and long-lasting socio-political ramifications.

The legacy of colonial duplicity manifests today in the form of neo-colonialism, where external powers often engage in economic interventions under the guise of development or partnership, compounded by practices that perpetuate economic dependency (Nkrumah, 1965). As Eduardo Galeano elucidates, these ongoing dynamics reveal the paradox of "aid" that often serves to reinforce unequal power relationships rather than foster genuine empowerment (Galeano, 1997).

The enduring mistrust and internal fractures within formerly colonized states can also be understood through the lens of post-colonial theory, which critiques the moral legacies of imperialism. Scholars such as Edward Said and Homi K. Bhabha challenge us to reconsider the narratives that dominate historical discourse and to interrogate the ethical responsibilities of contemporary global powers in addressing these historical injustices (Said, 1978; Bhabha, 1994).

As we interrogate the ethical dimensions of duplicity in diplomacy - whether through the tactical deception of superpowers during the Cold War or the convoluted justifications of colonial ambitions - we are compelled to confront a fundamental paradox: the pursuit of national interests often stands in stark opposition to ethical conduct. This analysis invites a re-evaluation of diplomatic practices, urging modern state actors to reflect on the moral consequences of their actions and to consider transparency, accountability, and a commitment to international norms as essential components of legitimate statecraft.

### **Alliances and Betrayals: The Fragility of Trust**

The nature of international alliances has historically been characterized by shifting loyalties and betrayals, out of which duplicity emerges as a recurring theme. The intricate web of alliances formed prior to World War I exemplifies how states often knowingly engaged in deceptive practices to secure strategic advantages.

The Entente Cordiale, formalized in 1904, ostensibly embodied a spirit of cooperation between Britain and France. However, it was rooted in mutual distrust of Germany and contained hidden tacit agreements that belied the public perception of unity (Mombauer, 2013). The resultant duplicity extended to the eventual entanglement of nations in the war, with agreements often prompting nations to act in self-interest, leading to catastrophic consequences.

Moreover, Japan's shift from the Axis Powers to an alliance with the Allies towards the end of World War II highlights the dynamic nature of alliances marked by duplicity. The signing of the Tripartite Pact in 1940, which sought to solidify military cooperation with Germany and Italy, revealed a façade of unity that belied Japan's eventual pivot as it sought to bolster its geopolitical standing post-war (Paine, 2012). This shifting landscape exemplifies Aristotle's notion of political fickleness - the idea that the pursuit of national interest often supersedes ideological fidelity.

### **The Evolution of Diplomacy and Changing Nature of Alliances**

The historical instances of duplicity outlined above have contributed to a significant evolution in diplomatic practice, prompting a re-evaluation of frameworks governing international relations. The post-Cold War era has shifted towards multipolarity, compelling states to navigate increasingly complex intersections of interests and alliances.

In this contemporary context, globalization has magnified the potential for duplicity while simultaneously creating mechanisms for accountability. The rise of international normative frameworks, such as the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine and the establishment of the International Criminal Court (ICC), signals an effort to codify ethical expectations within state interactions (Bellamy, 2015). However, these frameworks can be undermined by powerful states engaging in duplicitous practices, as seen in interventions justified under humanitarian pretexts that often serve broader strategic interests (Chomsky, 2016).

Additionally, the rapid advancement of technology has redefined diplomacy, with states now employing cyber strategies that emphasize deception and information manipulation. The proliferation of social media platforms facilitates the dissemination of disinformation campaigns, creating new challenges for diplomatic credibility. As Nye (2021) asserts, the traditional dimensions of power in diplomacy are increasingly augmented by "soft power," leading to a phenomenon where perception management can overshadow substantive diplomatic engagement.

In summary, the historical context of duplicity in diplomacy reveals a persistent pattern in international relations characterized by hidden agendas and strategic deception. Examining pivotal moments such as the Cold War, colonialism, and shifting alliances elucidates how duplicity shapes the contours of statecraft and stakeholder interactions. As diplomacy continues to evolve, the lessons learned from these historical precedents underline the importance of fostering transparency and establishing trust as fundamental components of international relations. By critically engaging with the complexities of duplicity, scholars and practitioners can work to mitigate its adverse effects and promote a more constructive and ethical framework for global diplomacy. The quest for integrity in diplomacy remains paramount as the international community continues to grapple with the legacies of past duplicities and the realities of an increasingly interconnected world.

### **Case Studies of Duplicity in Diplomacy**

The concept of duplicity in diplomacy denotes the strategic deployment of deceit, duplicity, or double-dealing in the pursuit of national interests and power dynamics among states. This phenomenon often manifests through actions that compromise the integrity of alliances and the

transparency of negotiations, whereby states pursue hidden agendas while maintaining a façade of cooperation or goodwill. In an era characterized by competing ideologies and geopolitical rivalries, such duplicity can shape interactions in profound ways, resulting in a complex tapestry of allegiances and betrayals. Thus, exploring the nuances of duplicity is crucial for a comprehensive understanding of the intricate dynamics that have historically influenced international relations.

### **Case Study 1: Cold War Alliances**

The Cold War represents a paradigmatic case study in the application of duplicity in diplomacy, wherein major global powers, principally the United States (U.S.) and the Soviet Union, engaged in a relentless struggle for ideological supremacy and geopolitical dominance between the late 1940s and early 1990s. During this period, both superpowers adopted strategies that were often marked by subterfuge and manipulation, reflecting the fluid nature of alliance politics and the inherent distrust that characterized the international system.

This case study will analytically explore the multifaceted dimensions of duplicity inherent in Cold War alliances through the lens of specific incidents, including espionage operations, orchestrated false flag activities, and covert interventions in third-party nations. For instance, operations such as the CIA's involvement in the Iranian coup of 1953 exemplify how duplicity was employed to undermine legitimate governments under the guise of promoting democracy and stability. Additionally, the utilization of misinformation and disinformation campaigns, particularly during crises like the Cuban Missile Crisis, further illustrates how both sides engaged in deception to manipulate perceptions and gain strategic advantages.

Furthermore, the Cold War's reliance on proxy wars highlights the complexity and ethical ambiguity surrounding diplomatic duplicity, as both superpowers sought to extend their influence while maintaining plausible deniability. By examining such incidents, this case study aims to elucidate the role of duplicity as a critical element in the broader narrative of Cold War diplomacy, revealing the intricate interplay between strategy, morality, and international order.

### **Duplicity in Cold War Alliances: Theoretical Framework**

To understand the role of duplicity in the Cold War geopolitical landscape, one must first consider the theoretical frameworks underpinning international relations during this period. The Realist paradigm, particularly as articulated by scholars like Hans Morgenthau, posits that states operate in a self-interested manner, prioritizing national security over moral considerations (Morgenthau, 1948). This self-interested behaviour inherently fosters an environment conducive to duplicity. Conversely, the Liberal perspective, which emphasizes cooperation and interdependence among states, often struggled against the backdrop of duplicity that characterized much of the Cold War (Keohane & Nye, 1977). This theoretical duality underscores the inherent tension between stated intentions and actual behaviours exhibited by the superpowers.

The U.S. and the Soviet Union's respective ideologies - capitalism and liberal democracy versus communism and Marxist-Leninism - created an environment ripe for duplicity in foreign policy. Both entities often adopted a rhetoric of cooperation and peaceful coexistence while simultaneously engaging in covert actions aimed at undermining one another's influence. The manifestation of these duplicative behaviours can be observed across multiple dimensions, including espionage and false flag operations, both critical to understanding the intricacies of Cold War diplomacy.



## **Espionage and Spy Operations: A Game of Information**

### **The Espionage Arms Race**

The Cold War was characterized by an intense espionage arms race, as both the U.S. and the Soviet Union deployed a range of covert operations designed to collect intelligence, manipulate perceptions, and destabilize perceived threats. Espionage served as a crucial mechanism through which both superpowers engaged in duplicity, often presenting misleading narratives domestically and internationally.

One of the defining incidents illustrative of this duplicity was the U-2 incident of 1960, wherein U.S. pilot Francis Gary Powers, operating a high-altitude surveillance aircraft, was shot down over Soviet airspace. The U.S. government initially maintained that the mission was solely focused on meteorological research (Schoenherr, 2020). This public stance was a blatant attempt to mask the duplicity of U.S. espionage objectives, which sought to gather strategic military intelligence from the Soviet Union's nuclear developments.

The subsequent Soviet announcement of Powers' capture, coupled with the display of the U-2's wreckage, compelled the Eisenhower administration to pivot from denial to negotiation. The incident severely damaged U.S.-Soviet relations and instigated a period of heightened tensions culminating in the 1961 Vienna Summit, where discussions of arms control were complicated by mistrust and accusations of duplicity (Gaddis, 2005). This event epitomized how espionage could subvert diplomatic dialogue, revealing the dual roles that information and misrepresentation played in Cold War strategy.

### **Operation Gladio: NATO's Secret Army**

Moreover, the inception of Operation Gladio in the late 1940s exemplifies the extent to which duplicity permeated espionage strategies during the Cold War. This clandestine NATO initiative was designed to establish "stay-behind" networks in Western European countries as a countermeasure against potential Soviet invasions. Yet, these networks operated with a high degree of secrecy, often outside the purview of democratic oversight and, in some cases, collaborated with extremist groups to ensure anti-communist sentiments (Krajcar, 2020).

The operations carried out under Gladio are indicative of a more profound duplicity inherent in Cold War alliances. While publicly NATO professed a commitment to collective defence and democratic ideals, the secretive nature of Gladio operations lent itself to accusations of undermining democratic principles through manipulation and subterfuge (Meyer, 2014). The revelations about Gladio's activities in the 1990s raised profound ethical questions concerning statecraft, reflecting the duplicitous underpinnings of national security policy during the Cold War.

In addition to the notable example of Operation Gladio, NATO's covert actions throughout the Cold War extended to various instances of political manipulation in nations like Italy and Greece, further illustrating the organization's duplicity beyond military preparedness. The theoretical framework of Realism in International Relations, particularly the emphasis on state behaviour driven by power dynamics and national interests, can elucidate NATO's strategic choices during this period.

In Italy, the aftermath of World War II was characterized by a rising influence of the Italian Communist Party (PCI), prompting profound anxiety among NATO allies about the potential for a communist takeover in a founding member of Western democratic ideals. To counter this perceived threat, NATO engaged in a series of covert interventions designed to influence Italy's political landscape. A significant instance occurred during the 1948 Italian elections, a pivotal moment where the United States, leveraging its intelligence resources, executed an operation

that included financial backing for moderate and conservative parties. This support was not merely benevolent; it involved complex tactics including psychological operations aimed at discrediting communist candidates, thereby manipulating the electoral process (Pike, 1991). These actions starkly contrast NATO's public commits to democratic ideals, highlighting a profound ethical dissonance within its operational paradigm.

Similarly, in Greece, NATO's involvement during the Greek Civil War (1946-1949) exemplified its willingness to prioritize strategic interests over democratic processes. The U.S. and NATO's provision of military advisors and material support to the royalist government against communist insurgents constituted an explicit alignment with authoritarian governance (Bourantas, 2016). The CIA's covert operations in Greece served not only to stabilize a regime compliant with Western interests but also to systematically undermine leftist organizations through direct interventions - thereby prioritizing geopolitical stability over genuine democratic aspirations. This approach resonates with the principles of Hegemonic Stability Theory, which posits that dominant powers like the U.S. enforce order that retains their pre-eminence, often at the expense of local governance structures.

*The juxtaposition of NATO's public rhetoric endorsing democracy and its covert actions across various regions underscores a profound dichotomy in its operational philosophy. For instance, declarations of commitment to self-determination and democratic ideals stood in stark contrast to interventions that supported authoritarian regimes in the name of combating communism, revealing the extent of selective moral reasoning driving NATO's strategic imperatives.*

In Latin America, for instance, NATO's indirect support for anti-communist military coups throughout the 1970s is reflective of this pattern. While primarily focused on Europe, covert NATO operations and U.S. interventions in countries such as Chile during the coup against Salvador Allende in 1973 exhibited a contrived commitment to combating communism, while simultaneously abdicating responsibility for the democratic aspirations of Latin American nations (Smith, 2020). Such actions reveal a broader strategy of promoting stability aligned with Western hegemony, often at the cost of local democratic movements.

Furthermore, drawing upon Post-Colonial Theory, one can analyse how NATO's actions in these regions extended beyond mere political manipulation; they embodied a form of neocolonialism, where Western powers exerted control over sovereign states under the guise of promoting freedom from communism. This ideological framework allows for a critical examination of how NATO's duplicity, manifesting through clandestine operations, continued to perpetuate systems of power that favoured Western interests, undermining the authentic voices of those in the Global South.

In conclusion, the duality of NATO's overt commitments to democracy and collective security, juxtaposed with its covert operations, provides crucial insights into the moral and ethical complexities characterizing Cold War statecraft. The instances of interference in Italy and Greece, when analysed through theoretical lenses such as Realism and Post-Colonial Theory, underscore that NATO's duplicity was not limited to Gladio but was a pervasive element of its strategic framework during the Cold War.

## **False Flag Operations: Manipulating Perceptions**

### **The Gulf of Tonkin Incident**

In addition to espionage, false flag operations were instrumental in shaping Cold War narratives and justifying military interventions under the guise of national security. One of the most consequential examples of such duplicity is the Gulf of Tonkin Incident in August 1964, which catalysed the U.S. escalation of military involvement in Vietnam.

The original justification for military action stemmed from claims that North Vietnamese forces had attacked U.S. naval vessels in the Gulf of Tonkin. Subsequent legislative action, specifically the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, enabled President Lyndon B. Johnson to deploy conventional military forces without a formal declaration of war. However, declassified materials and historical analyses have suggested that the second alleged attack was exaggerated or entirely fabricated (Hoffman, 2018; Turner, 2015). This orchestration of misleading information constitutes a prime example of duplicity in Cold War diplomacy, as the U.S. government manipulated public perception to achieve its military objectives.

The Gulf of Tonkin incident underscores the interplay between public deception and military strategy, a dynamic that characterized much of U.S. foreign policy during the era. The ethical ramifications of this incident prompted scholars to reconsider the tension between security imperatives and democratic accountability in policymaking, reflecting the intricate relationship between duplicity and statecraft (Herring, 2002).

In summing up, the case study of Cold War alliances highlights the pervasive nature of duplicity in international relations during this tumultuous period. Through an in-depth analysis of espionage operations and false flag incidents, we observe how the U.S. and Soviet Union employed deceitful tactics to navigate their geopolitical ambitions, often leading to unintended consequences for both domestic and international stability. This duality between stated intentions and realpolitik actions reveals a profound ethical conundrum inherent in statecraft - a reality that resonates in contemporary diplomacy as global powers continue to grapple with the legacies of Cold War duplicity.

As the spectre of modern-day conflicts emerges, informed engagement with the historical instances of duplicity encapsulated in the Cold War can provide critical insights for policymakers today. Recognizing the perils of misinformation and the consequence of duplicitous behaviour remains crucial in fostering a more transparent and accountable diplomatic framework, essential for navigating the complexities of contemporary international relations.

## **Case Study 2: Recent Geopolitical Conflicts**

In the contemporary landscape of international relations, the phenomenon of duplicity manifests in various sophisticated forms, complicating the interplay between state actions and international norms. This case study examines two pivotal geopolitical conflicts: the South China Sea (SCS) disputes and the Ukraine crisis. By analysing these instances, we explore the role of disinformation campaigns and cyber diplomacy, delineating how duplicity serves as a strategic tool in contemporary geopolitical manoeuvring.

### **The South China Sea: Sovereignty, Strategy and Sophistication**

#### **Background and Contestation of Claims**

The South China Sea, a vital maritime region characterized by lucrative natural resources and strategic shipping lanes, is embroiled in territorial disputes involving China, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Brunei. China's assertive claims, symbolized by the "Nine-Dash Line," have incited regional tensions and drawn international scrutiny, particularly from the United States and other Western allies advocating for a rules-based maritime order (Hayton, 2014). The complexities surrounding competing sovereignty claims elucidate the strategic nuances of duplicity in state policy.

## **Disinformation Campaigns: The Art of Strategic Manipulation**

China's diplomatic and territorial strategies in the SCS illustrate a sophisticated deployment of disinformation, blending historical narrative with contemporary statecraft. The Chinese government has leveraged historical documents and narratives asserting sovereignty over the region, often exaggerating these claims to craft a compelling narrative for both domestic and international audiences.

For instance, Beijing's portrayal of its activities as defensive rather than aggressive is indicative of a broader strategy aimed at redrawing perceptions of legitimacy. This juxtaposition of rhetoric and action serves to unify domestic sentiment while alienating potential regional allies. The Chinese state-run media's coverage of the 2016 Permanent Court of Arbitration ruling highlights this duplicity, as the court deemed that China's comprehensive claims had no legal basis, yet the Chinese leadership characterized the verdict as a Western plot to undermine its sovereignty, reaffirming domestic narratives of victimization and external hostility (Zhang, 2016). Such manipulation of truth serves to evoke nationalism and consolidate the Communist Party's authority amidst an ongoing legitimacy crisis (Shin, 2016).

### **Comparative Analysis of Disinformation Strategies**

#### **China's Historical Narrative in the South China Sea**

China's approach to disinformation in the South China Sea (SCS) serves as a case study in the deployment of historical narrative to assert territorial claims. Beijing's use of the "nine-dash line" - which is based on historical maps - purports to create a territorial legitimacy that is bolstered by state-sponsored media campaigns. Notably, the 2016 Permanent Court of Arbitration ruling, which dismissed China's claims as lacking legal foundation, was reframed by the Chinese government as a manifestation of Western imperialism, thereby consolidating domestic support through nationalist sentiment (Zhang, 2016).

#### **Russia's Use of Historical Narratives**

Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014 and its ongoing conflict in Eastern Ukraine exemplify a parallel disinformation strategy. The Kremlin has historically invoked the narrative of the "historic Russian lands" to justify its actions, suggesting that Crimea rightfully belongs to Russia. State-controlled media outlets propagate a narrative that frames Russia as a protector of ethnically Russian citizens outside its borders and as a bulwark against NATO aggression. The rhetoric surrounding the "defence of Russian speakers" reflects similar tactics employed by China, where both countries employ victimhood and historical grievance to justify territorial expansion (Tsygankov, 2019).

#### **Iran's Information Warfare in the Middle East**

Similarly, Iran's use of disinformation aligns with these tactics through the construction of a narrative around its regional influence. Tehran promotes a narrative of being a victim of Western colonialism and imperialism, particularly in its engagements in Syria and Iraq, where it supports various militia groups. Iranian state media often portray these actions as efforts to retaliate against foreign aggressors, utilizing historical grievances related to Western intervention in the region. By positioning itself as a defender of Shia populations and an opponent of U.S. hegemony, Iran reinforces its domestic legitimacy (Vaezi, 2020).

#### **The United States and Historical Manipulation in Global Campaigns**

The United States has also employed disinformation practices historically, particularly through its efforts in the Cold War. The narrative surrounding the Vietnam War involved disseminating misleading information that framed U.S. involvement as a fight for freedom against

communism. The controversial Gulf of Tonkin incident, which was exaggerated to justify military escalation, exemplifies how states manipulate information to garner public support for foreign interventions (Hoffman, 2016).

Finally, the analysis of disinformation across these various global contexts highlights a commonality in the ways states manipulate historical narratives to assert legitimacy both domestically and internationally. By invoking historical grievances and framing their actions as defensive responses to external threats, these countries - China, Russia, Iran, and the United States - create a façade that justifies often aggressive geopolitical manoeuvres. This manipulation of truth not only serves to rally domestic support but also complicates international relations, as other states are drawn into the narrative wars surrounding legitimacy and sovereignty.

Thus, understanding these parallel strategies is crucial for scholars and policymakers alike, as disinformation has become an enduring feature of contemporary geopolitical landscapes, necessitating a concerted global response to counteract these manipulative narratives.

### **Cyber Diplomacy: Coercion and Manipulation**

Moreover, cyber diplomacy blends forms of coercion with soft power, a duality that complicates traditional statecraft. China's digital strategy in the SCS encompasses cyber intrusions designed to undermine rival states' territorial claims and disrupt their political coherence. Reports have suggested that Chinese cyber operations targeted Vietnamese oil exploration activities, employing tactics that combined espionage with psychological operations (Wang et al., 2020).

The Digital Silk Road, an extension of China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), further serves as a mechanism of influence, facilitating technological dependencies while promoting narratives favourable to Beijing. Through the provision of telecommunications infrastructure, China seeks to embed its technological reach in regional states, offering resources that reinforce its geopolitical narratives while providing avenues for potential coercive leverage (Chen, 2022).

Similarly, China's cyber diplomacy, particularly in the context of the South China Sea (SCS), exemplifies a deliberate strategy that interweaves elements of coercion and soft power. This duality - whereby cyber operations are employed not merely as tools for espionage but also as instruments of psychological warfare - complicates traditional frameworks of statecraft (Wang et al., 2020). China's utilization of cyber intrusions to undermine the territorial claims of rival states, notably targeting Vietnamese oil exploration activities, underscores the need for a broader comparative perspective that can illuminate the responses of other powers.

The United States, responding to China's aggressive digital tactics, has articulated a proactive multilateral approach that underscores the importance of cybersecurity as an integral component of its foreign policy. The U.S. has established the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) to bolster domestic resilience while engaging in partnerships with nations in the Indo-Pacific to enhance their cyber defences. These collaborative efforts reflect an understanding that cyber threats transcend national borders, necessitating coordinated strategies to mitigate risks. Furthermore, the U.S. has increasingly leveraged its technological primacy by promoting democratic norms surrounding cybersecurity, thus providing an ideological counterweight to China's narrative (Chen, 2022).

India, on the other hand, demonstrates a nuanced response that includes both defensive and offensive strategies. Recognizing the existential threat posed by Chinese cyber operations, India has taken significant steps to enhance its cyber infrastructure. The cybersecurity

frameworks established through initiatives like the National Cyber Security Policy signify India's commitment to building resilience against external cyber threats. Additionally, India's participation in the Quad and other regional alliances signifies its intent to construct a collaborative front against Chinese influence. This partnership not only emphasizes military and economic cooperation but also addresses the digital domain, where cyber norms and best practices are increasingly pivotal (Chen, 2022).

The analysis of the U.S. and India's responses to China's cyber diplomacy invites a deeper exploration of the notion of "strategic ambiguity" as employed by these nations. Both powers engage in a delicate balancing act of deterrence and engagement, where the articulation of capabilities - such as cyber warfare techniques and technology-sharing agreements - serves to signal resolve while simultaneously enabling diplomatic channels to remain open. This dual strategy complicates the simplistic binary of confrontation versus cooperation, highlighting the importance of adaptive strategies in the face of emerging global challenges.

## **The Ukraine Crisis: Conflict, Narratives and Cyber Warfare**

### **Background and Contextual Dynamics**

The Ukraine crisis, precipitated by Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014 and subsequent intervention in the Donbas region, illustrates a tableau of duplicity that integrates military aggression, identity politics, and information warfare. The tactic of utilizing disinformation as a means of obfuscating intent is paramount in Russia's broader strategy toward Ukraine.

### **Disinformation and Strategic Narratives**

Russia's narrative surrounding the Ukraine crisis emphasizes themes of historical ownership and protection of ethnic Russians, often framing its actions as humanitarian intervention. Such framing serves not only to justify military engagement but also to engender identity-based solidarity among Russian-speaking populations in Ukraine. The Kremlin's assertions regarding the legitimacy of the Ukrainian government as a product of Western influence exemplify how disinformation operates as a tool of statecraft (Snyder, 2018).

A notable case of disinformation was the depiction of the Euromaidan protests. The Russian media portrayed the protests as a fascist coup sponsored by Western powers, thereby legitimizing subsequent military interventions on the pretext of restoring order and protecting Russian citizens (Roudakov, 2016). This narrative manipulation underscores the duplicity surrounding state claims of sovereignty and protection, as Russia's overt military actions contradict its self-portrayed image as a guardian of regional stability.

### **Cyber Warfare: Disruption as Strategy**

Cyber warfare has emerged as a transformative dimension of modern conflict within the context of the Ukraine crisis. The 2015 cyberattack on Ukraine's power grid, attributed to Russian hackers, exemplifies a strategic deployment of cyber capabilities aimed at both disruption and psychological warfare, reflecting the complex dynamics of hybrid warfare where military, technological, and informational tactics converge (Zetter, 2016).

The Ukrainian government's ability to recover from such disruptions, underscores resilience, yet the psychological impact of such attacks serves to reinforce narratives of vulnerability and external threat. This dynamic illustrates how cyber diplomacy and information warfare have introduced new asymmetries into state relations, complicating traditional frameworks of deterrence and conflict resolution (Hoffman, 2017).

## **Implications for International Diplomacy: Navigating Duplicity**

Both the South China Sea and Ukraine crises illuminate the multifaceted nature of duplicity in contemporary international diplomacy, where disinformation and cyber strategies redefine the contours of power dynamics. These cases raise profound questions regarding the future of statecraft, emphasizing the need for critical engagement with narratives that shape geopolitical realities.

### **The Role of International Norms and Institutional Responses**

As duplication in state behaviour proliferates, international norms and institutional responses require a thorough re-evaluation. Conventional mechanisms of diplomacy must adapt to the pernicious realities posed by disinformation and cyber warfare, necessitating frameworks that incorporate transparency, accountability, and ethical considerations into diplomatic communications (Malinova, 2021).

To counter disinformation and hybrid threats effectively, several nuanced and specific international frameworks and norms can be proposed:

**Global Information Integrity Standards:** The establishment of global standards for information verification could be foundational in combating disinformation. Such standards should be informed by interdisciplinary research encompassing media studies, cybersecurity, and international law. By delineating clear methodologies for fact-checking and information verification, these standards would not only bolster the credibility of communication among states but also enhance the capacity of civil society organizations to engage in counter-narratives. This could foster a more transparent information ecosystem, thereby fortifying democratic engagement globally.

**Cyber Diplomacy Treaties:** The creation of binding agreements that define acceptable behaviour in cyberspace represents a strategic pivot towards mitigating hybrid threats. These treaties should incorporate principles drawn from existing arms control agreements, emphasizing verification mechanisms, compliance measures, and sanctions for violations. Such a framework would encourage states to engage collaboratively while deterring adversarial actions through a clearly articulated normative structure, potentially transforming the international response to cyber incursion into a more rule-based system.

**Multilateral Response Frameworks:** The development of coalitions among democratic states, like NATO's collective defence principle, could yield powerful results in addressing disinformation. This model would require a commitment to a shared democratic ethos and could involve establishing rapid response teams to counter disinformation campaigns. Drawing on social science methodologies, these frameworks should be assessed for effectiveness regularly, ensuring that they evolve in response to emerging threats and maintain relevance in a dynamic geopolitical landscape.

**Accountability Mechanisms:** Institutionalizing accountability for state-sponsored disinformation efforts is crucial for fostering deterrence. Proposing a specialized international body - akin to the International Criminal Court - focused on overseeing cyber activities could embolden states to adhere to ethical norms in cyberspace. Such a mechanism would not only investigate allegations of disinformation but also set precedents for legal accountability, thereby reinforcing the importance of state responsibility in maintaining international peace.

**Resilience-Building Initiatives:** International frameworks aimed at bolstering the resilience of vulnerable states should engage in comprehensive capacity-building initiatives that include technological assistance, public education campaigns, and policy development support. These initiatives should be informed by an understanding of sociopolitical contexts, recognizing that

resilience is not merely a technical question but interwoven with issues of governance, civil liberties, and societal cohesion. Fostering a culture of critical media literacy can empower populations to resist disinformation, ultimately promoting informed civic engagement.

In sum, the geopolitical crises typified by the South China Sea disputes and the Ukraine conflict underscore the pervasive role of duplicity in shaping contemporary international relations. The strategic deployment of disinformation and cyber diplomacy complicates traditional conceptions of sovereignty, ethics, and diplomacy; hence, it compels a robust re-evaluation of existing frameworks for conflict resolution and engagement. As states increasingly navigate a world characterized by hybrid threats, an unwavering commitment to transparency, accountability, and cooperative frameworks becomes paramount in countering the corrosive effects of duplicity on diplomacy.

### **Case Study 3: Regional Conflicts and the Dynamics of Duplicity in the Middle East and South Asia**

In the complex landscape of regional politics, duplicity manifests through multifaceted alliances, strategic deceptions, and conflicting narratives. This case study explores duplicity within the contexts of the Middle East and South Asia, emphasizing how nations navigate alliances while engaging in deceptive practices. Through rigorous analysis, this exploration reflects on the historical, socio-political, and strategic nuances underpinning duplicity, highlighting the ramifications not only for regional stability but also for international relations.

#### **The Middle East: Alliances, Deceptions and Geopolitical Calculations**

##### **Historical Context of Duplicity**

The Middle East is fraught with a history of hostilities shaped by colonial legacies, sectarian divides, and authoritarian governance. Post-World War I, the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire catalysed the emergence of nation-states that still grapple with colonial-era borders and unresolved national identities. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 and subsequent interventions laid the groundwork for an increasingly polarized region characterized by mistrust (Zurcher, 2019). The Iranian Revolution of 1979 marked a turning point, solidifying ideological divisions that transformed regional alliances and antagonisms, primarily between Shia-majority Iran and Sunni-majority states like Saudi Arabia.

##### **The Iranian-Saudi Rivalry**

The conflict in Yemen serves as a profound example of duplicity within the Iranian-Saudi rivalry. The Yemeni civil war, which escalated in 2015, is characterized by Iran's support for the Houthi rebels and Saudi Arabia's military intervention aimed at restoring the ousted Yemeni government. Officially, Iran frames its support for the Houthis as part of a broader resistance to foreign intervention that upholds sovereign rights, while Saudi Arabia presents its military actions as essential for regional stability and the fight against Iranian influence (Lia, 2018).

Iran's strategy involves leveraging non-state actors to project power without directly engaging in military conflict. This strategy is normalized through a narrative of anti-imperialism and Islamic solidarity, masking the geopolitical ambitions of Iran as merely protective (Mabon, 2019). In contrast, Saudi Arabia employs significant state resources to promote its narrative that the Houthis are an extension of Iranian aggression, thus justifying military action as a defence of its national security (Harris, 2020).

##### **Disinformation Campaigns**

The Iranian-Saudi rivalry is further exacerbated by sophisticated disinformation campaigns designed to shape global perceptions. For example, in the disinformation realm, Saudi Arabia



has utilized its media outlets like Al Arabiya to disseminate narratives depicting Iran as a destabilizing force in the region. At the same time, Iran's state-sponsored outlets portray Saudi Arabia as an American puppet, reinforcing the perceived legitimacy of Iranian involvement in the region (Kirkpatrick, 2021). These campaigns contribute to growing sectarian tensions and reinforce existing divisions.

### **Alliances with Non-State Actors**

In the Middle East, alliances with non-state actors are paramount for state survival and influence. Iran's strategic relations with Hezbollah in Lebanon illustrate the extension of its sphere of influence through allied militia. As Hezbollah adheres to and propagates Iranian ideological tenets while also functioning as Iran's proxy in regional conflicts, its involvement in Syria underscores the utility of non-state actors in prosecuting foreign policy objectives without direct state engagement (Culcasi, 2016).

Similarly, Saudi Arabia has historically supported various Sunni militant groups, such as those involved in the Syrian Civil War. The nature of these alliances allows both Iran and Saudi Arabia to evade direct military confrontation while engaging in clandestine operations that escalate regional conflicts. This tactic complicates the diplomatic landscape significantly, as third parties find navigating relations with such states increasingly challenging.

### **The Role of External Powers**

The involvement of external powers such as the United States and Russia introduces additional layers of complexity to duplicity in Middle Eastern politics. The U.S. has cultivated a long-standing alliance with Saudi Arabia based on mutual interests in oil and security cooperation aimed at countering Iranian influence in the region (Khalidi, 2013). However, U.S. policies are often perceived as duplicitous as they simultaneously engage with Iran, such as in the negotiations over the Iran nuclear deal (the JCPOA), which large segments of the Gulf states view as a betrayal of U.S. commitments to contain Iranian ambitions (Katzman, 2020).

Moscow's intervention in the Syrian Civil War further underscores duplicity in its foreign relations strategy, as it has positioned itself as a stabilizing force while exploiting the chaos to re-establish its influence in the Middle East. Russia's partnership with Iran to support the Assad regime reveals a tactical collaboration that simultaneously allows both nations to enhance their geopolitical standing while portraying themselves as defenders of sovereign states (Freeman, 2017).

### **South Asia: Navigating Alliances amidst Duplicity**

#### **The India-Pakistan Rivalry**

In South Asia, the longstanding rivalry between India and Pakistan serves as a compelling case study of duplicity. Rooted in the partition of 1947, where religious identities became the basis for national boundaries, the India-Pakistan conflict has led to substantial military confrontations and ongoing hostilities, particularly over Kashmir. Since the 1990s, both nations have used duplicity as a strategy to navigate their relations with both regional allies and external powers.

#### **Pakistan's Use of Proxy Wars**

Pakistan's support for insurgent groups in Kashmir exemplifies duplicity in its national narrative. Islamabad maintains a stance of moral righteousness—that it supports the Kashmiri insurgency as part of a struggle for self-determination against alleged Indian oppression. Nonetheless, independent analyses often reveal substantial military and logistical support

provided by Pakistani intelligence services to groups such as Lashkar-e-Taiba, complicating its claims of non-involvement (Shah, 2015).

Conversely, India has adopted a strategy of counter-insurgency operations while projecting itself as a responsible regional actor committed to peace. Direct military actions in response to cross-border terrorism are often couched in disingenuous narratives aimed at fostering international support under the guise of legitimacy (Dutta, 2018). India's use of sophisticated public diplomacy strategically positions it as a victim of terrorism while undermining Pakistan's claims of legitimate defence.

### **The U.S.-Pakistan and U.S.-India Relations**

The fluctuating relationship between Pakistan and the United States compounds the duplicity in South Asian geopolitics. Following 9/11, Pakistan positioned itself as an essential ally in the U.S.-led War on Terror, obfuscating its continued military collaboration with the Taliban while publicly advocating for counterterrorism efforts (Rashid, 2015). This duality of purpose has engendered significant mistrust and scepticism in U.S. diplomatic circles regarding Pakistan's authenticity as an ally.

Meanwhile, India's engagement with the United States has strengthened, particularly under the framework of strategic partnership aimed at countering China's influence. However, India's duplicity lies in its simultaneous efforts to engage with Russian arms markets and diplomatic relations while aligning itself with the West against common threats (Menon, 2016). Negotiated arms deals with Russia, particularly concerning the S-400 missile systems, present a perplexing dynamic as both nations seek to balance their relationships with global powers while pursuing national interests.

### **China's Role and the Dynamics of Strategic Alliances**

China's rising influence in South Asia complicates regional dynamics, especially through its deepening collaboration with Pakistan, framed within the context of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC). This process has fostered a narrative of economic cooperation, but analysts argue that it also serves China's strategic objectives of containing India and securing its regional interests in Central Asia (Friedman, 2020).

India's response to China's expansion, particularly in the Indian Ocean Region, manifests a careful diplomatic dance that involves both military preparedness and international engagement with like-minded nations, notably the Quad partnership with the U.S., Japan, and Australia. This response reveals a duplicity in Indian strategy as it adapts a defensive posture while promoting narratives of peaceful coexistence and dialogue with neighbouring powers (Cohen, 2019).

### **The Costs and Consequences of Duplicity in Regional Conflicts**

The examination of duplicity in regional politics, particularly in the Middle East and South Asia, reveals the complexities inherent in alliances, strategic behaviours, and the interplay of geopolitical interests. The utilization of disinformation, manipulation of narratives, and engagement with non-state actors enable states to pursue their objectives while obscuring their intentions, significantly complicating the international diplomatic landscape.

However, such practices carry substantial costs, eroding trust among nations, blurring ethical boundaries in diplomacy, and increasing the risk of miscalculations and unintended escalations. The erosion of stable diplomatic relations - coupled with an increasing proclivity towards authoritarian governance models in the region - may exacerbate the potential for conflict.

In navigating an increasingly precarious international environment, it remains imperative for states to foster transparency and principled diplomacy, engaging in cooperative strategies that prioritize mutual interests over deception. Toward this aim, there is a significant need for the international community to promote accountability, norms, and frameworks that can stabilize regional relations while counteracting the pernicious effects of duplicity.

### **Mechanisms and Tools of Duplicity in Diplomacy**

Duplicity in diplomacy refers to the strategic use of deception and manipulation by states to achieve their objectives while misrepresenting their true intentions to other nations and their own populations. This phenomenon involves several sophisticated mechanisms and tools, notably propaganda, deceptive negotiation tactics, and the management of alliances. A nuanced examination of these elements elucidates their implications for international relations and statecraft, emphasizing the need for accountability and transparency in diplomatic practices.

### **Propaganda: Shaping Perceptions through Media**

#### **Definition and Function**

Propaganda utilizes strategic messaging through various channels to manipulate public perception, influence political discourse, and legitimize state actions. While traditionally associated with overt misinformation, modern propaganda encompasses subtler forms of persuasion, including framing, spin, and omission of critical facts (Jowett & O'Donnell, 2019). The primary goal is to craft narratives that serve national interests, often at the expense of objective truth and genuine dialogue.

#### **Mechanisms of Propaganda**

**State-Controlled Media:** Authoritarian regimes primarily utilize state media to propagate government narratives, leading to a homogenized public perception. In Russia, for instance, state-controlled outlets like Rossiya 1 serve as vehicles for disseminating pro-Kremlin narratives while portraying the West as a threat. This strategy aims to consolidate domestic support for foreign interventions, such as in Ukraine or Syria (Goffman, 2020).

**Social Media and Technological Innovation:** The rise of digital platforms has revolutionized propaganda dissemination, allowing states and non-state actors to reach vast audiences instantaneously. Notably, the Russian Internet Research Agency utilized social media platforms during the 2016 U.S. presidential elections to create divisions along ideological lines, demonstrating how digital propaganda can manipulate perceptions and influence electoral politics (Tucker et al., 2017).

**Cultural Diplomacy:** Propaganda is also implemented through cultural exchanges, arts, and sports, creating soft power that can bolster national identity abroad. For instance, China's Confucius Institutes aim to promote Chinese language and culture while concurrently reinforcing a narrative of peaceful rise and harmonious international relations (Shambaugh, 2016). Critics, however, have raised concerns about the ideological control exerted by these institutions.

#### **Implications**

The ramifications of state-sponsored propaganda extend far beyond immediate political advantages; they can precipitate long-term societal polarization, invigorate extremist movements, and severely diminish the credibility of nations in international discourse. The proliferation of competing narratives fosters an environment of distrust, complicating diplomatic interactions and undermining the already fragile framework of international cooperation (Horton, 2019).

Moreover, propaganda serves as a potent tool for fostering nationalism, particularly in times of crisis, wherein governments may employ it to elicit "rally-around-the-flag" effects. Such campaigns often manipulate national symbols, historical grievances, and collective identity to galvanize public support and unify disparate groups under a common cause. This strategic invocation of nationalism can obscure legitimate dissent and transform it into a perceived threat to national cohesion, consequently deepening societal divides.

The implications of this dynamic are multifaceted. On one hand, the short-term benefits of heightened unity may enable state actors to consolidate power and diminish opposition. On the other hand, the accompanying erosion of trust in alternative narratives can lead to heightened polarization, where divergent groups become increasingly alienated from one another. This polarization not only complicates the political landscape within states but also poses significant obstacles to international collaboration, as competing national narratives may clash on the global stage.

The persistent reliance on propagandistic measures to foster nationalism exemplifies a broader trend toward the normalization of distrust and antagonism in public discourse. As governments manipulate information to achieve strategic ends, the prospects for constructive international dialogue and cooperation dwindle, exacerbating global challenges that require collective action. Thus, while propaganda may achieve immediate governmental objectives, its long-term consequences may unravel the very fabric of societal cohesion and international relations.

## **Negotiation Tactics: Deceptive Agreements and Hidden Agendas**

### **Definition and Function**

Negotiation tactics in diplomacy often involve elements of deception, where states engage in discussions with divergent objectives or concealed intentions. This capacity for duplicity complicates bilateral and multilateral engagements, yielding outcomes that may not reflect the supposed mutual benefits.

### **Mechanisms of Deceptive Negotiations**

**Ambiguous Language and Legalese:** The strategic use of ambiguous terminology in treaties enables multiple interpretations, facilitating compliance only when favourable to one party. For example, during the 2015 climate negotiations in Paris, the phrase "nationally determined contributions" allowed states such as the U.S. and China considerable latitude in setting their emissions targets without a binding commitment (Hovi et al., 2016).

**Secret Agreements and Backroom Deals:** States often engage in clandestine negotiations that yield side agreements, undermining public trust once revealed. The 1994 Oslo Accords between Israel and Palestine included secret provisions that were not disclosed to the public, leading to significant backlash when these terms were later discovered, contributing to the ongoing conflict (Pappé, 2006).

**False Concessions and Misleading Demands:** Diplomats may employ strategies such as false concessions - publicly yielding on a non-essential issue while solidifying their position on a critical matter. This tactic can mislead the opposing party into believing they have achieved significant victories while sidelining their true objectives, as seen in various rounds of nuclear negotiations between the U.S. and North Korea (Bernstein, 2018).

### **Implications**

Deceptive negotiation tactics often result in short-term gains but deter future diplomatic engagement due to eroded trust. The complex layers of truth and falsehood create a volatile

environment where miscalculations can escalate into more significant conflicts, undermining stability and cooperation (Mearsheimer, 2001).

## **Alliances: Managing Relationships While Pursuing Self-Interest**

### **Definition and Function**

Alliances are critical in statecraft, allowing nations to pool resources, share intelligence, and collaborate against perceived threats. However, their management frequently involves duplicity, as states navigate relationships while prioritizing their self-interest.

### **Mechanisms of Duplicity in Alliances**

**Selective Partnerships:** Nations cultivate relationships based on the circumstantial alignment of interests rather than ideologically consistent alliances. Turkey's involvement in NATO, while concurrently engaging with Russia on military issues, illustrates the complexity of contemporary alliances where states prioritize strategic benefits regardless of their formal commitments (Güney, 2019).

**Feigning Loyalty while Pursuing Hidden Agendas:** Countries may outwardly express loyalty to an alliance while covertly collaborating with rival states for economic or security benefits. Qatar has maintained close relations with both the U.S. and Iran, often highlighting its unique positioning as a mediator while simultaneously providing support to Islamist factions across the region (Husain, 2020).

**Proxy Alliances:** The use of non-state actors to achieve political objectives allows states to exert influence without overt engagement in conflict. Iran's support for Hezbollah in Lebanon is not merely ideological; it serves as a counterweight to Israel and influences regional dynamics without direct Iranian military involvement, complicating the geopolitical landscape in the Middle East (Katzman, 2019).

### **Implications of Proxy Alliances for International Efforts**

**Impact on Peace Processes:** The entrenchment of proxy alliances significantly complicates diplomatic efforts aimed at conflict resolution. Iran's support for Hezbollah exemplifies how non-state actors influence state-centric diplomatic frameworks. For instance, the presence of Hezbollah as a formidable political and military entity in Lebanon complicates conventional peace negotiations, particularly between Israel and Lebanon, as it operates independently of state structures and often disregards governmental authority. As noted by counterterrorism experts, Hezbollah's refusal to disarm, despite the Lebanese government's stance, epitomizes the challenge posed by proxy groups that act autonomously, thus subverting state sovereignty and control over peace efforts (Hoffman, 2006).

Furthermore, the enduring presence of Hezbollah forces an expansion of the conflict narrative, as peace negotiations must address not only state actors but also a multitude of interests represented by armed groups. This reality necessitates a multiparty engagement strategy that is often logistically and politically complex, thereby extending the timeline for potential resolutions (Zartman, 2000).

**Challenges for Humanitarian Aid:** In conflict-affected regions where proxy groups exert influence, the integrity of humanitarian operations is at risk. Hezbollah's control over specific territories in Lebanon illustrates how non-state actors can manipulate humanitarian aid for political leverage. The relationship between humanitarian agencies and armed groups is often fraught with challenges; as noted by Slim (2015), humanitarian organizations face the dilemma of negotiating access with groups like Hezbollah that may impose conditions or seek to use aid as a tool to bolster their influence.

This manipulation of humanitarian assistance not only undermines the principles of impartiality and neutrality that underpin humanitarian law but also complicates assessments of needs and resource distribution. The politicization of aid can result in disparities that exacerbate existing vulnerabilities within affected populations, leading to further destabilization (Donini, 2012).

**Broader Geopolitical Implications:** The foundational mechanisms underlying proxy alliances reveal a landscape where states pursue strategic calculations predicated on short-term gains, often at the expense of long-term stability. The concept of selective partnerships, as articulated by Güney (2019), frames these relationships within a context where states navigate a global order characterized by shifting alliances and competing narratives.

Turkey's dual engagement with NATO and Russia, for example, raises critical questions about the coherence of international alliances in addressing global security challenges, particularly in the face of rising authoritarianism and nationalism. This duality reflects a pragmatic approach where states prioritize strategic autonomy over ideological coherence.

Moreover, the phenomenon of feigning loyalty while pursuing ulterior objectives is evident in Qatar's diplomatic balancing act. Qatar's positioning as a mediator is often questioned considering its support for Islamist factions, thus illustrating the potential for duplicity in state relations, as highlighted by Husain (2020). This duality complicates the prospects for conflict resolution by introducing layers of mistrust among regional actors and undermining the credibility of mediators.

Finally, the dynamics of proxy alliances, as exemplified by Iran's support for Hezbollah, elucidate profound challenges for international peace processes and humanitarian initiatives. Addressing these issues requires a comprehensive understanding of the motivations and operational landscapes of both state and non-state actors. Multidimensional and inclusive approaches that consider the interests of all stakeholders - including non-state actors - are essential in crafting effective strategies for achieving sustainable peace and humanitarian responsiveness.

### **Implications**

The duplicity inherent in alliance management can lead to a fragile international order marked by shifting allegiances and the potential for betrayal. The complexity of dual relationships often results in strategic miscalculations that can alter power balances, exacerbating conflicts in already unstable regions (Kahler, 2009).

Finally, the mechanisms and tools of duplicity in diplomacy - propaganda, deceptive negotiation tactics, and complex alliances - pose significant challenges for international relations. While these strategies can yield short-term advantages, they overwhelmingly contribute to a climate of mistrust, illustrating the need for greater transparency and integrity in diplomacy. Only by fostering genuine dialogue and cooperative frameworks can states hope to navigate the intricacies of modern geopolitics effectively. Enhanced accountability mechanisms will also serve to mitigate the long-term consequences of duplicity, paving the way for a more secure and stable international landscape.

### **Implications of Duplicity in International Relations**

Duplicity in international relations is often a significant factor in determining the dynamics of state interactions. It entails deception, manipulation, or misrepresentation of intentions among states and has profound implications for global security, trust, and international cooperation. A comprehensive analysis reveals that while duplicity can lead to instability, conflict, and erosion of trust, it may also be seen as a pragmatic tool in the competitive realm of global politics.

## Consequences of Duplicity on Global Security

### Erosion of Trust

**Loss of Credibility and Commitment:** Political theorist Robert Keohane (1984) argued that cooperation in international relations is fundamentally based on states' trust in each other. When duplicity undermines this trust, states begin to view international agreements as mere instruments for tactical advantage rather than commitments, leading to noncompliance and disengagement. The U.S.-Russia relations in the aftermath of Crimea's annexation in 2014 exemplify this; mutual accusations undermine collaborative frameworks such as arms control agreements, leading to accusations of breach (Mearsheimer, 2016).

**Impact on Smaller States:** Smaller states often rely heavily on the assurances of larger powers for security. When duplicity becomes a typical strategy, these smaller states may feel compelled to enhance their defensive postures, fearing betrayal. For example, in Asia, nations like Taiwan and South Korea regularly question U.S. fidelity to defence commitments, leading them to pursue self-help strategies, including their military capabilities, contributing to regional tension (Friedberg, 2018).

### Escalation of Conflicts

**Intelligence Manipulation:** The misuse of intelligence can lead to significant military escalations. The 2003 invasion of Iraq was predicated on alleged weapons of mass destruction (WMD) - claims that were later debunked as fabrications. This manipulation of intelligence not only destabilized Iraq but set off a chain reaction of regional upheaval, contributing to the emergence of ISIS and profound consequences for global security networks (Chomsky, 2014; Blix, 2003).

**Proxy Conflicts and Regional Instability:** Duplicity about intentions can result in acting through proxies to gain desired outcomes without direct confrontation. In Syria, for instance, Iranian and Turkish tactics of supporting opposing factions in a protracted civil war manifest strategic duplicity, as these states publicly call for peace while simultaneously fuelling conflict. This complexity leads to sustained violence and humanitarian crises, with over half of the Syrian population displaced by ongoing warfare (HRW, 2019).

### Impact on International Cooperation

#### Fragmentation of Global Governance

**Diminished Effectiveness of Existing Institutions:** When states engage in duplicity, it weakens the legitimacy and trustworthiness of international institutions. The United Nations, for instance, has often struggled to mediate conflicts owing to accusations of bias and manipulation by major powers. The Syrian Civil War is a salient example, with vetoes by Russia and China undermining UN peace efforts, leading to widespread humanitarian crises and a disillusionment with multilateralism (Väyrynen, 2019).

**Polarization and Isolationism:** Duplicity can lead to a fragmentation of international relations, promoting isolationist tendencies. As states face repeated breaches of trust, they may start to withdraw from international frameworks, as seen in the U.S.'s withdrawal from the Paris Agreement in 2017, which reflected a growing sentiment of disengagement from multilateralism perceived as ineffective or biased (Zissis & Blumenthal, 2020). Such fragmentation results in insufficient cooperation on global challenges like climate change and pandemics.

## Potentially Pragmatic Necessity

**Realpolitik and Strategic Survival:** In the anarchic nature of international relations, states are often compelled to prioritize survival and competitiveness over ethical norms. Duplicity becomes a rational strategy in a landscape marked by uncertainty. The principle of Realpolitik suggests that states will engage in manipulation and a profound understanding of the interests of others to achieve their objectives (Morgenthau, 1978). Instances of this can be observed during the Cold War when both the U.S. and the USSR engaged in duplicitous practices to further their strategic interests in a zero-sum environment.

**Temporary Necessity vs. Long-Term Trust:** While duplicity may yield immediate strategic advantages, its long-term impact can be detrimental. The U.S. and North Korea's interactions illustrate the tension; North Korea frequently engages in duplicity, making promises of denuclearization while continuing its weapons programs. This tension creates a dynamic where temporary agreements are reached, yet without genuine reform or trust-building, long-term stability remains elusive (Snyder, 2018).

## Duplicity as a Double-Edged Sword

### Path to Instability

**Cyclical Nature of Duplicity:** The cyclical nature of duplicity results in an erosion of norms that traditionally govern state interactions. States that feel misled often escalate their military postures, prompting offensive reactions from perceived adversaries. The military buildup in Eastern Europe post-2014, following Russia's annexation of Crimea and perceived threats against NATO, exemplifies how duplicity cultivates a persistent state of insecurity and armed tension (NATO, 2019).

**Humanitarian Consequences:** The morally ambiguous strategies attributable to duplicity often result in significant humanitarian costs. Ongoing conflicts in zones of duplicity, such as Yemen, demonstrate how states engage in proxy wars with less regard for civilian lives, leading to one of the world's worst humanitarian crises, involving widespread famine and public health disasters (UN, 2019).

### Necessary Evils

**Strategic Ambiguity in Security Alliances:** Certain instances of duplicity may not only be justifiable but deemed necessary for maintaining strategic advantages. The U.S. policy of strategic ambiguity regarding Taiwan serves as a deterrent against Chinese aggression. By not clarifying defence commitments, the U.S. maintains leverage over both Taiwan and China while avoiding direct commitments that could lead to military confrontations (Friedberg, 2020).

**Engagement through Manipulation:** States may deploy tactical duplicity to engage otherwise hostile parties in necessary negotiations. For instance, the negotiations surrounding the Iran nuclear deal demonstrated how states can adopt clandestine channels of communication and negotiation to achieve diplomatic breakthroughs, even in an environment characterized by mutual distrust (Katzman, 2019).

Finally, the implications of duplicity in international relations are characterized by a complex interplay of trust, security, and cooperation. Duplicity can erode long-standing partnerships and contribute to cycles of instability, as seen in contemporary geopolitical conflicts. Simultaneously, it evokes discussions about the pragmatic necessity of duplicity within the global political landscape. As states navigate the balance between strategic advantage and long-term stability, the challenge remains to devise mechanisms that enhance transparency and



rebuild trust within the international system. Future international relations may benefit from fostering a culture of integrity that discourages duplicity while emphasizing the importance of dialogue and cooperation in addressing shared global challenges.

### **Future Trends in Duplicity Diplomacy**

The practice of duplicity in diplomacy is subject to transformation under the influence of numerous factors shaping the contemporary global environment. As nation-states adjust their strategies in response to shifts in geopolitical dynamics, the emergence of non-state actors, and advances in technology, the implications for duplicity in international relations will evolve significantly. This exploration will detail these developments while incorporating rigorously referenced academic perspectives and empirical insights.

### **Changing Global Dynamics and Duplicity in Diplomacy**

#### **Multipolar World Order**

**Shifts in Power Dynamics:** The transition from a unipolar to multipolar world order is underscored by the rise of countries like China and India. The growth of China as an economic powerhouse, projected to surpass the U.S. in nominal GDP by 2028, has led to a recalibration of global influence. Scholars such as John Mearsheimer assert that rising powers often engage in strategic duplicity to secure their interests, as seen in China's increasing assertiveness in the South China Sea, which contradicts its publicly stated commitment to regional stability (Mearsheimer, 2018).

**Localized Rivalries and Strategic Alliances:** The emergence of regional powers often introduces new dimensions of conflict and competition. A prime example is the relationship between Saudi Arabia and Iran, where both nations engage in multi-layered diplomatic duplicity. They simultaneously promote narratives of regional leadership and cooperation while actively supporting proxy wars, as seen in Yemen and Syria. This duplicity not only fosters regional instability but complicates international efforts for peace, as evidenced in the amalgamation of conflicting interests in the Syria peace talks (Al Jazeera, 2019).

#### **Non-State Actors and Transnational Challenges**

**Transnational Networks and Duplicity:** The 21st century has observed the rise of non-state actors, such as multinational corporations, NGOs, and terrorist groups, which often operate independently of state control. Research highlights that states may engage in duplicity by aligning with or against these forces to manipulate outcomes to their advantage. For example, U.S. involvement in Syria oscillated between blatant support for moderate opposition groups while tacitly allying with Kurdish forces, thereby employing duplicity to navigate a complex actor landscape (Gordon, 2016).

**Collective Action Problems and Diplomatic Manipulation:** Issues such as climate change demand collective action, yet states often display duplicity by promoting green policies while simultaneously expanding fossil fuel industries. The case of Malaysia, which positions itself as a pro-environment nation while being a significant exporter of palm oil, reveals how duplicity can underpin national interests in the face of global expectations, ultimately hindering genuine cooperative efforts (Cheyns, 2019).

#### **The Role of Technology in Enabling or Combating Duplicity**

##### **Technological Advancements as Enablers of Duplicity**

**Dissemination of Disinformation:** The proliferation of social media platforms has provided fertile ground for disinformation campaigns, with state and non-state actors deploying advanced algorithms to craft narratives and shape public opinion. A landmark study by the

Oxford Internet Institute reports that over 70 countries engaged in some form of state-sponsored disinformation, using bots and fake accounts to manipulate discourse during elections and significant geopolitical events (Tucker et al., 2018).

**Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Analytics:** The integration of AI and machine learning into diplomatic strategies allows states to forecast opponents' moves and pre-emptively adapt their tactics, which may include deceptive practices. For example, AI can analyse social media sentiment to discern public opinion on international issues, enabling governments to tailor their messaging strategically. This manipulation of public perception enhances duplicity, as states can obscure their intentions while projecting misleading images of cooperation (Shin et al., 2018).

### **Technology as a Tool for Combating Duplicity**

**Digital Transparency Initiatives:** In response to the threats posed by duplicity, there has been a push for greater transparency in governance and international relations through digital reforms. Global initiatives like the Open Government Partnership, which promotes open data and accountability, demonstrate how technology can counteract misinformation and improve state accountability (Open Government Partnership, 2020). The ability of civil society to engage with governments through these platforms enhances oversight and undermines the efficacy of duplicity.

**Cybersecurity Measures:** As states recognize the risks associated with manipulated narratives and cyber operations, developing cybersecurity protocols becomes crucial. The focus on building resilience against disinformation campaigns showcases a collective acknowledgment of the need to combat duplicity through secure communication, information veracity checks, and international agreements on cyber norms (NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence, 2020).

### **The Future of Diplomacy: Ethical Considerations and Normative Frameworks**

#### **Ethical Dimensions and Normative Changes**

**The Evolving Normativity of Diplomatic Practices:** As society emphasizes ethical governance, pressure mounts on states to adhere to stricter norms that reduce duplicity in diplomacy. Charles Tilly's concept of "trustworthiness" highlights that sustained cooperation relies on states' ability to engage credibly. As such, nations may encounter increasing diplomatic isolation if they resort to duplicity, particularly when global movements highlight the need for ethical practices in governance (Tilly, 2005).

**The Role of Global Governance Institutions:** International organizations, such as the United Nations, may play a pivotal role in moderating duplicity within the global system by enforcing norms and establishing accountability mechanisms for state behaviour. The enactment of the Convention Against Corruption (2003) and efforts to regulate arms sales reflect the international community's recognition of the detrimental effects of duplicity on global stability (UNODC, 2004).

In sum, the future landscape of duplicity in diplomacy is one of complexity and transformation, shaped by multipolar power dynamics, the ascendancy of non-state actors, and advances in technology. While duplicity may provide short-term tactical advantages, the long-term ramifications could push states toward more transparent and accountable practices amidst increasing scrutiny from global civil society and international institutions. As technological innovation simultaneously facilitates and combats duplicity, the imperative for states to embrace ethical diplomacy will be paramount in navigating the intricate web of modern international relations.

## Conclusion

In synthesizing the findings of this paper, I have critically examined the multifaceted phenomenon of duplicity in diplomatic practices within the contemporary context of international relations. The complexities arising from shifting power dynamics, the rise of non-state actors, the impactful role of technology, and evolving ethical norms highlight the intricate web of duplicity that characterizes modern diplomacy.

## Key Findings

**Shifts in Global Dynamics:** The transition toward a multipolar world order necessitates a re-evaluation of traditional diplomatic strategies as emerging powers assert their influence. The concept of geopolitical competition, as advanced by scholars like Robert Gilpin (1981), elucidates how states engage in power struggles that often involve duplicity. For instance, China's assertive manoeuvres in the South China Sea reflect a dual approach of territorial expansion paired with claims of peaceful coexistence. This duality underscores the necessity of recognizing duplicity as a core component of state behaviour in an evolving geopolitical landscape.

**Impact of Non-State Actors:** Non-state entities significantly complicate the diplomatic landscape. The growing influence of multinational corporations, terrorists, and NGOs has destabilized traditional state-centric models of international relations. Examining the case of the International Criminal Court (ICC) reveals the duplicity exhibited by states that champion human rights reforms while simultaneously undermining the ICC's authority. Such contradictions highlight the need for an essential analytic framework that accounts for the diverse motivations and strategies of both state and non-state actors (Keck & Sikkink, 1998).

**Technological Advancements:** The emergence of digital platforms and advanced technology poses both challenges and opportunities in diplomatic contexts. The phenomenon of "information warfare" - as documented by the RAND Corporation (2018) - illustrates how states leverage social media and artificial intelligence to systematically disseminate misinformation. This manipulation impacts public opinions and policy outcomes, indicating that understanding the technological dimensions of duplicity is indispensable for critical analysis. Conversely, the role of blockchain technology for establishing unverifiable diplomatic agreements offers a pathway to enhance transparency (Tapscott & Tapscott, 2016).

**Evolving Ethical Norms in Diplomacy:** The increasing demand for ethical standards in international relations reinforces the need to scrutinize duplicity. The concept of "soft power," coined by Joseph Nye (2004), emphasizes the importance of moral authority and reputation in global politics. This evolving ethical landscape raises questions about the sustainability of duplicitous strategies as public and governmental scrutiny grows. The 2019 Ethos Report by the Global Diplomacy Lab further emphasizes that ethical engagement is not merely aspirational but essential for fostering stable international relationships.

## Importance of Recognizing Duplicity

Recognizing duplicity in diplomatic interactions is essential for a comprehensive understanding of the motivations and strategies that shape international relations. The fluidity between practiced norms and stated policies often results in a disconnect that complicates how states navigate complex interdependencies. By probing deeper into instances of duplicity, scholars and practitioners alike can better understand the underlying power dynamics and conflicting interests that shape state behaviour. This recognition is vital for developing mechanisms that mitigate conflict, promote integrity, and enhance collaborative efforts,

underscoring the critical relevance of critical realism in understanding state-engaged duplicity (Wendt, 1999).

### **Areas for Future Research and Policy Implications**

**In-depth Case Studies:** Future research stands to benefit from detailed case studies centred on significant diplomatic negotiations marked by duplicity. Such analyses should adopt a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative insights with quantitative measures of diplomatic success or failure. This could involve examining high-stakes negotiations, such as the Iran Nuclear Deal, and unpacking the layers of duplicity at play (Parsi, 2017). Comparative studies of successful versus unsuccessful diplomatic engagements would contribute to a richer understanding of how duplicity can be effectively managed or countered.

**Technological Impact on Peacebuilding:** Investigating the potential of emerging technologies to enhance peacebuilding is an important area for exploration. Future research should analyse how machine learning, sentiment analysis, and big data analytics can positively shape public diplomacy, facilitate dialogue, and improve the accuracy of information dissemination. Moreover, a rigorous examination of policy frameworks regarding the ethical deployment of technology in diplomacy will enrich our understanding of how technology can both challenge and bolster ethical considerations in international relations.

**Norm Development in Diplomacy:** A concerted effort toward understanding and formulating normative frameworks that dissuade duplicity in international relations is necessary. Research should focus on how international institutions, such as the United Nations, can create more robust accountability mechanisms that promote truthfulness in diplomatic negotiations. This may involve studying successful case studies of norm adoption and enforcement to develop prescriptions for future international agreements.

**Education and Training Initiatives:** Comprehensive curricula in diplomatic training programs that emphasize the recognition, management, and implications of duplicity will be essential to preparing future diplomats. Educational research should explore integrative pedagogical approaches that equip diplomats with ethical frameworks and skills necessary to navigate environments marked by competing narratives. This includes simulations to practice identification and countermeasures against duplicity while fostering a commitment to ethical diplomacy.

### **Gaps in this Study**

There exist several gaps in this study. Hereunder, I present and discussed some of them:

**Empirical Research on Public Sentiment and Duplicity:** There exists a dearth of empirical research linking citizen perceptions to governmental duplicity in foreign affairs. Drawing on social constructivist theories, future studies could apply quantitative methods - such as surveys and experimental designs - to analyse how public opinion influences state behaviour concerning duplicity. This can be complemented by qualitative research through interviews and focus groups to provide depth and context regarding public interpretations of diplomatic actions. In doing so, scholars can investigate the feedback loops between public sentiment and policy outcomes, ultimately evaluating whether citizen awareness of duplicity can deter or promote such practices.

**Comparative Analyses of Regional Approaches to Duplicity:** The literature would benefit from comparative studies that aggregate case studies across different world regions using a regional lens. Constructivist frameworks suggest that local cultural norms and historical legacies influence state behaviour (Wendt, 1999). Research can employ a comparative historical analysis methodology (Mahoney & Rueschemeyer, 2003) to study how regions with

different historical experiences (e.g., colonialism in Africa vs. post-Cold War dynamics in Eastern Europe) approach and justify duplicity in statecraft. Such analyses could contribute to understanding how varying degrees of state legitimacy, historical grievances, and local governance structures impact the propensity for duplicity.

**Impact of Non-State Actors on State Duplicity:** An exploration of the role of non-state actors - especially considering globalization - could yield significant insights into duplicity. Scholars might utilize actor-network theory (Latour, 2005) to analyse how multinational corporations, terrorist organizations, and NGOs influence states' diplomatic practices in both cooperative and adversarial contexts. This could involve case studies that assess how these actors push states towards duplicity as a strategy for survival or manipulation, thereby complicating the traditional state-centric view of international relations.

**Longitudinal Studies on the Consequences of Duplicity:** There is a compelling need for longitudinal studies deploying mixed methods to assess the long-term consequences of duplicity in state relations. Employing quantitative methods to track diplomatic relations' trajectories over decades while correlating specific instances of duplicity may reveal patterns of regression in state trust, alliance formation, and international cooperation. By integrating qualitative interviews with diplomatic historians, researchers can sediment the findings within historical contexts, elucidating the interplay between past duplicity and present diplomatic dynamics.

**Ethical Frameworks and Norms Development:** A nuanced exploration of how states might construct effective ethical frameworks to counter duplicity remains under-researched. Normative theories of international relations, particularly just war theory and the responsibility to protect (R2P) doctrine (Bellamy, 2008), can be utilized to frame discussions around accountability and the ethical imperatives of state actions. Research could develop comprehensive normative frameworks that provide guidelines for ethical diplomacy expected to align with contemporary global standards, possibly utilizing participatory action research to involve stakeholders in crafting these norms.

**Technological Impact on Peacebuilding:** Investigating the influence of technology on diplomatic practices and duplicity requires more scholarly attention. The integration of cybersecurity frameworks, artificial intelligence, and data analytics in negotiation and conflict resolution presents both challenges and opportunities. Scholars could use a combination of ethnographic methods and policy analyses to study how technology is leveraged to either engage in duplicity or promote transparency and accountability in international diplomacy. This research could draw from critical security studies to examine how emerging technologies shape state interactions and perceptions.

**Psychological and Cultural Dimensions of Duplicity:** Research could benefit from employing theories from psychology and sociology - such as social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and narrative theory (Bruner, 1990) - to explore how cultural factors and collective identities shape the acceptance or rejection of duplicity in diplomacy. An interdisciplinary approach could involve empirical methodologies, such as surveys on cultural attitudes toward state morality, alongside qualitative analyses of national narratives in historical texts, speeches, or media portrayals. Examining how duplicity is rationalized or condemned in different cultural contexts may reveal deeper insights into the practice.

**Interdisciplinary Perspectives:** Engaging in interdisciplinary research combining insights from political science, communication studies, law, and ethics could further ground an understanding of duplicity in diplomacy. For instance, employing insights from legal scholars on international law's role in regulating state behaviour could enhance comprehension of

accountability mechanisms. Exploring diplomatic ethics in this context can provide a holistic view of how duplicity operates not only as a strategic choice but also as a phenomenon deeply implicated in broader ethical considerations governing international relations.

**Norm Development in Diplomacy:** Understanding how to cultivate robust norms against duplicity demands further exploration. Research could analyse case studies of effective norm implementation in other fields, such as environmental agreements or human rights protocols, deploying theories of norm evolution (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998). Exploring the mechanisms through which states collectively establish norms to mitigate duplicity may provide valuable insights into reinforcing ethical practices in contemporary diplomacy.

**In-depth Case Studies of Resilience against Duplicity:** The academic landscape lacks comprehensive analysis of states or institutions that have successfully navigated or minimized the effects of duplicity through innovative diplomatic practices. Researchers could investigate these cases using a comparative methods approach to delineate strategies for fostering transparency and trust-building in diplomatic encounters, examining both high-profile treaties and localized agreements.

In conclusion, therefore, addressing these nuanced gaps in the body of literature on duplicity diplomacy will not only enrich academic discourse but will also pave the way toward developing frameworks that promote accountability and transparency in international relations. A rigorous examination of duplicity through diverse lenses will inform policymakers seeking to navigate the complexities of global diplomacy in a rapidly changing world. Future research that integrates multiple methodologies and theoretical perspectives will contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of duplicity's role in shaping state behaviour and the implications for global governance.

### Final Thoughts

As international relations continue to evolve within an increasingly complex and interconnected global environment, the examination of duplicity becomes crucial in understanding international dynamics. Duplicity, often manifested through deceitful practices in diplomatic interactions, can create environments of mistrust and conflict. A study published in the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (2020) revealed that nations with systemic issues of transparency experienced, on average, a 29% increase in conflict incidents over a decade, compared to their more transparent counterparts. This substantial statistic underscores the critical link between transparency and stability in international relations.

The interplay of technological advancements - especially in information dissemination - has further complicated the dynamics of duplicity. Various platforms for misinformation dissemination can precipitate greater misunderstanding among nations. A 2021 analysis by the Pew Research Centre indicated that approximately 64% of experts believed that the rise of social media had significantly exacerbated the challenges of disinformation, highlighting the need for robust frameworks combating the dual threats of duplicity and misinformation.

In addressing the implications of duplicity, stakeholders can leverage both ethical considerations and strategic frameworks. According to the *Harvard Kennedy School's Negotiation Journal* (2022), diplomatic negotiations that incorporate transparency ideals are correlated with a 34% increase in successful outcomes. This evidences a substantial payoff for nations committed to ethical diplomacy; transparent communication not only fosters trust but also enhances bilateral relations.

Addressing the challenges posed by duplicity is imperative for pragmatic diplomacy, which is essential in mitigating conflicts and nurturing a cooperative international framework. Research

conducted by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (2020) highlighted that 70% of conflicts - be they geopolitical disputes or trade tensions - are significantly intensified by the prevalence of misinformation and deceptive practices. By prioritizing transparency and accountability, nations can work toward a more integrated global structure, ultimately benefiting collective peace and stability.

In conclusion, as the global landscape evolves, the need for nuanced approaches that reconcile ethical considerations with strategic interests is paramount. Stakeholders must not only acknowledge the challenges presented by duplicity but also actively engage in fostering a diplomatic environment characterized by mutual respect and openness. This proactive engagement will not only mitigate potential conflicts but also lay the groundwork for sustainable global cooperation - an endeavour vital for the preservation of peace in an increasingly polarized world.

## REFERENCES

- Al Jazeera. (2019). *Iran-Saudi rivalry: A timeline*. Al Jazeera.
- Arora, P., & Evans, A. (2018). Media framing and international relations. *Journal of International Communication*, 24(1), 85-100.
- Bacon, T. (2019). The KGB's active measures during the Cold War: A look at Soviet disinformation tactics. *Journal of Cold War Studies*.
- Benkler, Y. (2016). The age of misinformation: How tech companies made the debate on truth irrelevant. *Harvard Law Review*.
- Bernstein, A. (2018). The North Korea crisis and US foreign policy. *Hudson Institute*.
- Blix, H. (2003). *Disarming Iraq*. Pantheon Books.
- Börzel, T. A., & Risse, T. (2005). Conceptualizing the domestic sources of regional integration: Comparing Europe and Asia. *The Pacific Review*.
- Brinkley, D. (2002). *The Second World War: A biography*. Penguin Books.
- Carr, E. H. (1964). *The Twenty years' crisis, 1919–1939: An introduction to the study of international relations*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. Oxford University Press.
- Cheyns, E. (2019). The role of corporate social responsibility in the palm oil sector: Implications for farmers and environmental change. *Sustainability*, 11(12), 3267.
- Chomsky, N. (2014). *Hegemony or survival: America's quest for global dominance*. Metropolitan Books.
- Cohen, E. (2020). Perceptions of duplicity: Media narratives in international diplomacy. *Global Media Journal*, 18(3), 45-60.
- Cohen, S. P. (2019). *India: Emerging power*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Culcasi, K. (2016). Hezbollah: The unlikely ally of Iran in the Syrian conflict. *Middle East Policy*.
- Denzin, N. K. (2017). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Routledge.
- Dreiling, M., & Wolf, J. (2001). The politics of globalization: A comparison of the U.S. and European Union. *American Sociological Review*.
- Dutta, S. (2018). India's counter-insurgency operations in Kashmir: Perceptions and realities. *Security Studies*.
- Freeman, C. (2017). Why Russia is supporting Assad's regime, and what that means for the future of Syria. *Foreign Affairs*, 96(3), 22-26.
- Friedberg, A. L. (2018). *A contest for supremacy: China, America, and the struggle for mastery in Asia*. W.W. Norton.
- Friedberg, A. L. (2020). The future of U.S.-China relations: Is conflict inevitable? *International Security*, 45(4), 5-50.
- Friedman, A. (2016). The politics of duplicity: The role of deception in international relations. *International Studies Review*, 18(4), 689-706.
- Gaddis, J. L. (2005). *The Cold War: A new history*. Penguin Press.



- Gee, J. P. (2014). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. Routledge.
- Gilpin, R. (1981). *War and change in world politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, P. (2016). The U.S. in Syria: A case of diplomatic ambivalence. *The Washington Quarterly*, 39(4), 159-176.
- Güney, A. (2019). Turkey's dual foreign policy: Navigating between East and West. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 42(2), 195-217.
- Harris, S. (2020). The Saudi-Iranian rivalry and the future of the Middle East. *Middle East Quarterly*.
- Hawthorne, A. (2021). The hidden playbook: Duplicity and diplomacy in international affairs. *Foreign Affairs*, 100(3), 22-28.
- Herring, G. C. (2002). America's coming-of-age in the Vietnam War. *The Journal of American History*.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1987). *The age of empire: 1875-1914*. Vintage Books.
- Hovi, J., Skodvin, T., & Holst, R. (2016). The politics of the Paris Agreement. *Global Environmental Politics*, 16(1), 30-49.
- HRW (Human Rights Watch). (2019). *World report 2019: Events of 2018*. Human Rights Watch.
- Husain, A. (2020). Qatar's foreign policy: Balancing between rivals. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 56(5), 727-745.
- Jentleson, B. W., & Whytock, C. (2005). Who 'won' Libya? The force-diplomacy debate and its implications for theory and practice. *International Security*, 30(3), 47-86.
- Jowett, G. S., & O'Donnell, V. (2019). *Propaganda and persuasion*. Sage Publications.
- Kahler, M. (2009). Complex networks and regional powers: A new approach. *Global Governance*, 15(4), 419-442.
- Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics*. Cornell University Press.
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (2012). *Power and interdependence: World politics in transition*. Longman.
- Kern, D. (2020). Strategic ambiguity in international diplomacy: The balancing act of power and trust. *Diplomatic Studies*, 30(2), 221-238.
- Kissinger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster.
- Krajcar, I. (2020). Operation Gladio: Understanding NATO's secret armies. *Journal of International Relations*.
- Lake, D. A. (2018). The state and the politics of globalization: Duplicity and strategy in the international system. *World Politics*, 70(1), 1-30.
- Liu, F. (2016). China's response to the South China Sea arbitration: A media perspective. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 2(2), 131-148.
- Luttwak, E. N. (1990). From geopolitics to geo-economics: Logic of conflict, grammar of commerce. *The National Interest*, 20, 17-23.

- Mabon, S. (2019). Iran: The key to Middle Eastern stability? *Journal of Strategic Studies*.
- Malinova, A. (2021). Diplomacy in a post-truth era: Countering disinformation strategies on the global stage. *Global Governance*.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. W.W. Norton.
- Menon, S. (2016). Unfolding the Kashmir conflict: India's military operations. *Asian Security Studies*.
- Meyer, H. (2014). The conspiracy of silence: Gladio, NATO, and the secret war in Europe. *Historical Research*.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace*. Knopf.
- NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization). (2019). *NATO's adaptation to a changing security environment*. NATO Press Release.
- Nkrumah, K. (1965). *Neo-colonialism: The last stage of imperialism*. Panaf Books.
- Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. Public Affairs.
- Nye, J. S. (2008). *The powers to lead*. Oxford University Press.
- Nye, J. S. (2009). *The future of power*. Public Affairs.
- Paine, S. (2012). The Sino-Japanese War: China and Japan's struggle for power, 1894-1945. *Journal of International Relations*.
- Pappé, I. (2006). *The ethnic cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld Publications.
- Rachman, G. (2016). *Easternization: Asia's rise and America's decline*. Other Press.
- Rashid, A. (2015). *Pakistan: A modern history*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1990). Never-ending wars: The international relations of the future. *American Political Science Review*, 84(2), 415-425.
- Roudakov, A. (2016). The role of disinformation in Russia's narrative on Ukraine: From Maidan to the annexation of Crimea. *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 32(5), 432-445.
- Schlesinger, A. M. (2004). *A thousand days: John F. Kennedy in the White House*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Schoenherr, S. (2020). The U-2 incident: Espionage, diplomacy, and war. *Cold War History*.
- Shin, G. W. (2016). China's historical claims in the South China Sea: A scholarly assessment. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 16(3), 313-335.
- Sidaway, J. D. (2014). The geopolitics of duplicity: Space, knowledge, and power. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 39(2), 219-232.
- Simmons, B. A. (2018). Accountability in international relations: Balancing norms and interests. *Global Governance*, 24(3), 385-402.
- Snyder, T. (2018). *The road to unfreedom: Russia, Europe, America*. Tim Duggan Books.
- Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2016). *Blockchain revolution: How the technology behind Bitcoin is changing money, business, and the world*. Penguin.
- Trachtenberg, M. (2006). *The craft of international history: A guide to method*. Princeton University Press.
- Tucker, J. A., et al. (2018). Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature. Stanford University.

UN (United Nations). (2019). Humanitarian crisis in Yemen. *United Nations Press Release*.

UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime). (2004). *United Nations Convention Against Corruption*.

Väyrynen, R. (2019). The United Nations and global governance: A perspective from the global South. *Global Governance*, 25(4), 415–432.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge University Press.

Zarakol, A. (2018). *After defeat: How the East learned to live with the West*. Cambridge University Press.

Zhang, H. (2016). China's narrative about the South China Sea: Domestic politics and international strategy. *Journal of International Relations*.

Zissis, C., & Blumenthal, D. (2020). The consequences of U.S. withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. *Council on Foreign Relations*.

Zurcher, E. J. (2019). The Middle East in world politics: An analysis of regional dynamics. *Journal of Political Geography*.

### License

Copyright (c) 2024 Christian C. Madubuko



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). Authors retain copyright and grant the journal right of first publication with the work simultaneously licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC-BY\) 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) that allows others to share the work with an acknowledgment of the work's authorship and initial publication in this journal.