'Re-negotiating Diplomacy :
An Auto-ethnographic process'

By Intan Marzueani

(Work in progress- please do not quote without Author's permission)

Paper Submitted to "Ethnography and Practice Based Research" stream of the 5th Annual Joint University of Liverpool Management School and Keele University Institute for Public Policy and Management Ethnography symposium

(14,366 words)

**2010 Ethnography Symposium
on Current Developments in Ethnographic Research
in the Social and Management Sciences.**
Queen Mary University of London,
1st - 3rd September 2010

Doctoral Candidate
Department of Sociology
University of Warwick,
United Kingdom
marzueani@hotmail.com

Re-negotiating Diplomacy: *An Auto-Ethnographic Process*

I.   Prologue or Epilogue:

The postmodern ethnography faces an insurmountable challenge to gain 'scholarly' legitimacy, even despite the recent arsenal of literature in handbooks on Qualitative Research from esteemed publications encouraging alternative genres of research such as mix-method (Fielding & Fielding, 2008; Dixon Woods, Agarwal, Jones, Young & Sutton,2006), methodological and epistemological triangulation (Denzin,1978;Denzin,2005; Janoski,1991; Statham, Richardson & Cook 1991, (Pragmatic) Action Research (Greenwood and Levin,1998 & 2008; Eikeland, 2008), CAP[1] Ethnography (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) Poetical-Political Ethnography (Clifford & Marcus, 1986), Auto-Ethnography as performative text (Denzin, 1997; Friedwald, 1996 Chadwick, 2003 cited by Jones, 2005;) performance ethnography (Alexander, 2005) performatism (Eshelman, 2000) etc. Emerging scholars are still warned by their (always already post-modern) supervisor and examiners of the wisdom in not being too 'outspoken', of sticking close to pre-existing theories, that history (and in which case they almost always mean western history/philosophy) is the foundation to credible knowledge, that a MMRD[2] is "a scatter gun approach", that a Meta-Theory is neither necessary nor desired in a PhD thesis, and finally but not surprisingly; that a feminist post-modern theory of diplomacy is "bound to discredit western theories".

Thus "ambitious" is used as a derogatory term and mediocrity becomes overvalued. Yet whilst discouraging postmodernism, the objectors also always doubt the credentials of the postmodernist to be: Are you sure you don't mean post–structuralism? Feminism may be a better approach / Postmodernism must remain in the closet, you can't speak German; can you speak French? Where are your concepts? Show me your writing. These are just some of the ways that the diplomatic professor tells the student that she is stupid, unlearned or pretentious.

(last) Supervision in Philosophy

Student: "Yes, I've gone through the literature you suggested and I've decided to focus on Social Epistemology. I want to make a comparative study of the various theories of knowledge... you know; western philosophy: both analytic and social epistemology, Islamic epistemology, Chinese epistemology, femi...."

Philosopher: "Wait a minute... (frowning). There's no such thing as Chinese epistemology. (pause) There is just "Epistemology." "

---

[1] (Creative analytical processes)
[2] Mix Method Research Design

Student: [disappointed but smiles warmly]

Philosopher: "Look (exasperated), you are a very young girl...you don't know enough about western philosophy!"

Student: [smiles brightly : We are really the same age, you know. I'm not a "young girl" the way you mean it. You may know more western philosophies but your years of experience in professional philosophy are matched by my experience in international diplomacy. So I think we're on equal speaking terms. But ok, I'll take it as a feminine compliment, this 'age' thing. Go ahead then.]

Philosopher: (lowering his voice) "Just forget what these people (Social Epistemologists) are saying about truths or knowledge and all this nonsense about conceptual relativity or truth as method, or whatever... Their writings are not even worth reading. People get paid a lot of money just to write about truths, you know"

Student: [perplexed but continues smiling: Really? but is he talking about himself and the other analytic philosophers, or the social philosophers he clearly despise? Philosophers around here certainly drive expensive cars and have large research grants]

Philosopher: "Look! (Shouting to the delight of fellow philosophers outside) "What you are saying is just pure nonsense. You can't simply create a theory that the moon is made of blue cheese!"

Student: [Indeed! greatly offended yet very amused: beams warmly.]

Philosopher: "Female organ mutilation is irrational...And there's no such thing as a philosophy of Diplomacy either! (Furious and yelling) Such a thing doesn't exist in modern philosophy, or in Aristotle. If you let that happen it means that philosophy, a philosophy about anything can simply be created in the pubs!

Student: [...I wonder if he finds me attractive...Pubs? ...But isn't that how business is conducted around here? Every Wednesday when a guest philosopher is invited to the departmental seminar, all the hard core ponderings are carried over into the pub down the road. That's where the elite action is, that was the ritual:smiles in agreement.]

Philosopher: (pause and sits back) "Ok then, good. I must say though ... in the end, really I admire you...Here I am ... and you ...you just sit there smiling and agreeing..."

The student: "yes" (yes, smiling)

Through a short discourse on diplomacy, an instinct which began as mere curiosity can mutate into sheer alterity which follows through the instinct to its very demise. (Hurt) what can be greater than disappointment which arise out of a cherished self-deception snipped

out of the labyrinth of its delusions. In the most factual sense of the word; literally there is just "Epistemology." (A muted ache.) There was no diplomacy to soften the blow and none required for it was a matter of fact. Of (white male) truth. Of (western philosophy) reality. The professor says: " "Snow is white is true." because "snow is white" is true ". (Differences) He may as well have added that in any case "snow" is "white". (Tolerance) But there is no "Snow White" in the eastern horizon and thus no closure in the theatrical play of words. No limits to the negotiating of truths and identity; and thus no foreclosure in diplomacy (différance). And so we persevere in our estrangement, with all the weakness of a borrowed vocabulary and grammar, to speak the same language and maybe the same voice (a humble desire).

Perhaps it is just a matter of communication and representing, perhaps we can convince the alien Other that we have a story to tell, a different one which needs translating. (Optimism) So we smile and we listen warmly, for there is always a chance happening in conversation (a Hope). Thus, it was for the sake of wisdom as true freedom that we bracketed our disappointment, we muted our thoughts, postpone our anguish and ignore our hurt; and we brace ourselves for cruel truths, bearing forth all the sovereignty and immunity the Self can muster. And thus we become invincible. Insult turns to flattery, the offensive becomes funny, the incredible becomes monotonous, negative becomes positive and difference becomes fundamental to agreement. Everything melts away; we are masters of our own destiny. (Truths for sale) But, true freedom is indeed light and gay, deep and moving; and when sovereignty and immunity emanate from liberty of Selfhood; diplomacy simply beams in the face of insults, bias and hypocrisy. Knowledge is infinite and perhaps if one persevere, justice will be coming (Derrida, 1990 cited by Gehring, 1994[i]).

> "Sovereignty is mere liberty,
> that is, "the authority or power to do as one pleases:
> to decide, to choose,
> to determine oneself, to decide on oneself,
> To be master, and in particular master of oneself (autos, ipse).
> […] No liberty without selfhood,
> And no selfhood without liberty, vice versa.
> And thus a certain sovereignty."
>
> *Jacques Derrida,*
> *"Rogues", 2003[ii]*

As first philosophy, diplomacy requires perseverance even when bilateral relations are strained, even in the absence of reciprocity and even when stripped of accreditation and thus unrecognized. That is why the diplomatic smile charms, disarms and infuriates the philosopher who proclaims a universal language and ethics presiding over human interactions, history and future civilisations in an exclusively 'objectivistic' and 'rationalistic' manner. This is the back and forth momentum between the self-conscious and pre-

conscious states of diplomacy which erases the trace of its intended effect by deferment, inversion and containment. Not self deception, but self defence, self-deferral. An estrangement : time doubles upon itself and there is a mutual sense of perplexity. A sign (Cheese). A strangeness (Blue moon) is perceived. Hallucination? (Maybe madness of the mind) The room is breezy and bright. Serenity all around. (Anguish)

> "You have spoken a lot,
> only to realize that you never commanded silence"
> *(Bocchius, Symbolicarum Quaestionum[iii]).*

Indeed, but silence is the diplomat's golden tongue and the diplomatist thinks twice before saying nothing. Alas, it is the double predicament of diplomacy that without the humble pauses and regal silences, thoughts run astray of speech, but without words, without voice, thoughts remain in silent becoming and suspended from self. A delicate balance is needed and diplomacy begins in the self-discourse which intercepts the silences of a dialogue. Don't speak. Don't think, don't feel. Wait. Wait for the sign, seek for agreement. "Speaking frightens me because by never saying enough, I also say too much" (Derrida, 1967 p.9). Hence, the death of speech as intuitive protest against repulsive lyrics ("epistemology and cultures don't mix": racism, sexism; elitism, philosophism). The dying speech muted in the primordial rhythm between the Self and the Otherless (alienation and a moratorium on truth) overlaid in the discourse between Self and Other (estrangement and friendship). A de-alienation; a moment of diplomacy which arises always from a lingering potentiality of its presence. Diplomacy as grasped in the horizons of meanings, in the different sounds and rhythms and quivers of the breath; in the deferment of understanding, of words, thoughts or feelings requiring not mere inaction, but virtual action. Vigilance and Deferral, Difference and Différance (Derrida, 1967).

A subtle act; a Silence and a temporal Space; a prolongation in time which merges the Self-conscious with an infinite consciousness and is felt throughout the Self-being as itself; Nothingness. Thus, diplomacy requires a mediating silence to carry forth its full becoming. Diplomacy as a presence not to be mistaken by absence of mind or silence of understanding. But diplomacy as a divine pre-sense where at the end of death; speech re-awakens with renewed convictions in the wisdom of silence (vindication of *besire*). Diplomacy as a primal "beingness"; as a "Self-Otherness" between the Self, the Self-other, and the Otherless which is both pleasing and painful in its becoming. Thus, diplomacy is always the unspoken, the slipping by, the swallowed pain; the birth of which is felt like sunshine through blistering snow, a delicacy which melts resistance and permeate the sensuous flow of thoughts from the dark depths of the groin through the gulf of the heart, brimming forth as haze at the frontiers of the mind's eye. Smoky. Diplomacy? It was just a tearful dream.

> "The dream–thoughts and the dream content are presented to us like two versions of the same subject matter in two different languages..the dream content seems like a transcript of the dream-thoughts into another mode of expression.. The dream-content..is expressed as it were in a pictographic script, the characters of which have to be transposed individually into the language of thoughts...A dream is a picture puzzle..."

<div align="right">

Jacques Derrida, *"Freud and the scene of writing"*
(Writing and Difference, 1967 p. 275)

</div>

Then again, an outburst of difference fundamental; (Pub philosophy) mutually and reciprocally intolerable. ("Pub philosophy": sexism, idealism, atheism, intoxication). The Cut. It was a clean break. No hurt, no tears. Just a profound replay of an innate hymn, a monotonous dejavu, something always already known. Like a conscious sleep waiting for the morning bell. No, more like a waking dream. A *solicitation* and the whole foundations of the sacred bifurcation of theory and practice, belief and desire, ethics and politics, diplomacy and philosophy crumbles. A grand display and a sand castle no more. "*A rent poem whose structure appear as it bursts apart"* (Roussett, 1964[iv]) Hypocrisy revealed (the Sophists). An irony (the Cynics). Quickly then remorse evaporates into misty clouds. Deep warmth and gentle heat from an innate furnace. Action now, a genuine conviction (Certainty) And finally, first true action; first true smile of the heart. Unnoticed. Then abruptly as in all natural diplomatic encounters conversation dries up, it is the dawn of courtesies and exchanges of presents.

> "In speaking at the limit of silence we must organize a strategy
> and find [words] which reintroduce – at a point –
> the sovereign silence which interrupts articulated language"

<div align="right">

Jacques Derrida, "From Restricted to General Economy"
Writing and Difference, 1967 p.332)

</div>

(Pause) A rest and equal space in time. Then, attack of humility as a pleasant and perplexing surprise. ("I admire you") A graciousness deserving the status of a proud apology, but diplomacy not quite. Irrefutable, but a footnote nonetheless. A belated awareness of the Other. A pure accident. The mind not able to keep up with its doubling dilemmas. (No pauses) Thoughts overtaking the speed of voice. Catherxis. Hence, a pure but nonetheless weak concession, limp, arising too late and too abrupt at the end of the pillorying of differences. But, a Supplement nevertheless, the dangerous kind (Derrida, 1967) And in that one moment pause (an aura, pink, yellow and blue), the sunlight, the apples of the eye and a slip of tongue. Genuinely indeliberate, revealing its own paradoxes and thus infinitely better than an honest apology. (Beauty) A mirage? More like an arousing slumber. Amazement and affirmation of diplomacy, at once. Justice as experience of the impossible (Derrida, 2003). Thus, a gift of presence for both in equal proportion.

Admiration and admission. I confess, "yes" "I admire" you", "yes". Yet, sweet as it was, it was diplomacy in vain. Unpossessed, impotent. Degenerative. A fleeting diplomacy, it lacks the lustre and poignancy of diplomacy in the (double) "yes" at the end of a patient and peaceful journey towards *Theoria* (Constantinou,1996) "yes" as the perfect inscription of a smiling smile. A double action of dignity within a graceful absence.

> "...in order to criticize, to negate to deny, you have first to say "yes"
> When you address the Other, even if it is to oppose the Other
> You make a sort of promise- that is to address the Other as Other,
> Not to reduce the otherness of the Other,
> and to take into account the singularity of the Other."[3]

Hence the right moment for a breaking silence. "Yes" (yes). False agreement, end of conflict and alienation restored. Duplicity and a double diplomacy. Scandalous; the perfect act for the outer end which affirms agreement of agreement to disagree, negating altogether the possibility of agreement. A suspension. Ceasefire. A trick. A slip of pen.

> "yes is not a word like others,
> that even if you do not pronounce the word,
> There is a yes implicit in every language,
> even if you multiply the no there is a yes...[4]

But in the momentary breach of the temporal space between difference and *différances*, there come to being the brightness of a clear horizon and a surge of *energea*; youthfulness. A beguiling curiosity in an epoch of terror and optimism in dying. Diplomacy as Adulation; a toy, a play, a craft. An Adioneta- a song, a lyrical hymn. An Adamas- a hardness, an Adamantine- a diamond.

> "Yes" is even more originary then questioning...
> To ask a question you must first tell the other I am speaking to you
> Even to oppose or to challenge the Other
> You must say "at least I speak to you "
> "I say yes to our being in common together"
> [This is what I mean about love..
> Reaffirmation of the affirmation]"[5]

Jacques Derrida, An interview on Love (2008)

(Yes) Beautifully strange is diplomacy in its besire for peace and wisdom and in its dying moment, diplomatism is the silent pledge to doubly agree to disagree on differences and *différances* on/of speaking and writing (Derrida, 1967).

---

[3] An interview on Love with Jacques Derrida by Nikhil Padgaonkar (2008)
[4] Ibid
[5] Ibid

Postscript:

> "To define philosophy as the attempt to say
> the hyperbole is to confess..
> I philosophize only in terror, but in the confessed terror of going mad.
> The confession is simultaneously, at its present moment,
> oblivion and unveiling, protection and exposure: economy"
>
> *Jacques Derrida,*
> *(Cogito & the History of Madness, 1967 p. 76)*

Would an auto-hetero-deconstruction (Derrida, 1990) of philosophy suffice as a confession for a post-modern theory of diplomacy? Could the story of the philosopher's ruptured eardrum *("Tympaniser – la philosophie."*[6]) be accepted as part of the auto-ethnography on diplomacy? An epilogue is offered as a prologue only because intellectual diplomacy requires it. The "undecidabilities of the idea of truths" (Derrida, 1994) leads necessarily to the idea of diplomacy as duplicity (Constantinou, 1996) of truths hence just as "One must be just with justice", (Derrida, 1994[v]), "One must be diplomatic in diplomacy". *"A postmodern diplomacy entails retrieving the originary understandings of theory and diplomacy (Heidegger); exposing the dissemination of envois and their logos (Derrida); and recognizing that if theory is to speak about diplomacy, it must itself become diplomatic and employ fully the strategems and discourses of diplomacy"*(Constantinou; 1996, pg 40)

Hence a meta-theory of diplomacy will contain Prima philosophie (Meta-ethics) and may ground itself in "diplomatics"[vi](Constantinou,1996) as the de-constructive science of diplomacy, but in positing the transcendent Unknown in the discourse of truths, it remains committed to the double discourse of positivity and negativity, of symmetries and oppositions, of unity and trinity, of reciprocity, synchronicity and multiplicity. Thus, it presents the voice of a double predicament, of insecurity over differences in language, ethics and temporal space, and it incorporates the Other into discourse of the Self in ways which destroys preconceptions of truths, time or identity as a unitary phenomena. In this way, it is philosophically redundant but in itself, it creates time and space for the aesthetics of diplomacy to emerge. Thus, the knowledge we are concerned with here is that which is called 'appreciation of experience', the science and art of being and diplomacy as one of its modes.

II. Foreign Phantasies

Diplomacy is a fiction of hope and love. An evening tale told under the evening star; as a story at the eve of humanity when through Eve man discovered diplomacy and became

---

[6] Jacques Derrida, *Tympanon*, MARGES DE LA PHILOSOPHIE I-XXV, I (1972) cited by Petra Gehring, 1994

wholly human. According to the feminist tale, the dawn of diplomacy begins not as a consequence of the Fall of Adam and Eve and as compounded by the fratricide of Abel by Cain (Der Derian,1987[7]), nor from the moment of Adam's Creation to the Fall and later to the re-negotiation of the Covenant between God and Man at mount Sinai (Constantinou,1996[8]), but from the moment humanity was conceived through intercourse between Adam and Eve, and again with the conception of Christ by Mary. A birth twice told, the female fantasy of diplomacy begins with the myth of the duality of the human spirit pre-destined to remain estranged in tragic love.

> "the concept's baptism calls for a specifically philosophical taste
> that proceeds with violence or insinuation and
> constitutes a philosophical language within language
> – not just a vocabulary but a syntax
> that attains the sublime or a great beauty.

> *(Deleuze & Guattari,"What is philosophy?",p.8)*

Alas, but without estrangement with its natural Other; without opposite and perfect symmetry in Adam and Eve, the Self remains inward and lost in between impossible worlds of heaven and earth, dream and reality, *statis* and movement, the known and unknown. Only with the Other to refract one's beauty and echo one's spirit could the Self cope with solitary transience; that melancholic alienation from the "Otherless" (the One). A being so sa(i)d, one became two and two became three, for the endless mantra of diplomacy was borne of mercy and compassion for mankind. Thus, where once there was only (l)oneliness caught in estrangement with its Other, through divinity was diplomacy conceived as a Trinity between the Self, Other and the 'Self-Otherness'. Emanating as divine benevolence to mediate alienation of man from the Otherless but at once overcoming the estrangement between Adam and Eve through re-incarnation of divinity in the ecstasy of becoming human. Then at last, in this travesty of triangular love between the Self, Other and the Otherless, diplomacy emerge as humanity; in the of 'beingness'; not of the Self, nor of the Other but of the Self-Otherness between the Self and Other.

> "Diplomacy is about pain and sacrifice (pause)
> Its knowing that someone very dear to you is about to die ...(tears)
> And not being able to do anything about it
> ...just because you are faraway...someplace else"

> *Ambassador of Malaysia (Male, 56 years old)*
> *Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy,27 November 2009*

---

[7] pg. 51-52
[8] pg.113-114

Thus told, diplomacy as humanity incarnate and re-incarnate is a gift to mankind; the departing of a divine presence from the Otherless which remain elusive to the Self, but for the promise of eternity. Hence is the legendary tale of pain, pleasure and sacrifice in the sending forth of humanity as the re-creative force of life upon life, love upon pain and truth naturalized. Thus spoken, a genealogy of diplomacy emanates from the Godhead as the unspoken word between man and woman in the divine union between the Self and Other. That is why diplomacy; that carnal 'beingness' between the Self and Other is above all;- a divinely humane gift; a mutual giving and taking in the act of becoming human. That is why a phenomenology of diplomacy evoke the timely presence of a creative and loving 'being' and that is why diplomacy is a seductive process which tantalizes the imagination and frequently appear as a gift or presence. That is the female fantasy of diplomacy as the primordial intimacy of 'beingness' between the male and female which take the form of a humane gift, a 'birthright presence' of divine humanity pre-sent from the annals of human evolution.

Based on the legend of a lonely being entrapped in alienation and estrangement, (a double loneliness both in itself and between others) diplomacy is the immemorial doubleness of the human Self in its originary form: human 'being' as both male and female, both man and woman as divine beings and humanity as the spirit of Self-Otherness. This is the unity in the trinity which duplicates and multiplies itself in the phenomenology of diplomacy. Reciprocity and synchronicity constituting its essence, diplomacy in its mythical form is an a-historical phenomenon in the intercourse between man and woman, between Self and Others, and between humanity and its manifestations. This then is the myth of diplomacy evoked as humanity and creativity, in the multiplicity of duplicity in the epi-phenomena of 'Self-Otherness'.

> ..... Being- that which it gives – is what is sent.
> Each of its transformations remains destined in this manner.
> What is historical in the history of being is determined by what is sent forth in
> destining, not by an indeterminately thought up occurrence.

Martin Heideger, On time and Being pg 8-9

III.   Feminist Diplomacy

To many IR scholars, feminist imageries may be simply irrelevant to the discipline; and in a profession dominated by men and a discipline preoccupied with masculine concerns such as power, politics and war, feminine sentiments, desires or emotions are the taboos of diplomatic discourse. They are considered frivolous, childish or sexually embarrassing; and therefore, less rational, less real and less objective by macho standards

of what counts as knowledge, truth or professionalism (cf. Tickner,1997; Svedberg,2002; Smith,2002). But feminist fantasies are warranted if only because a genealogy which exclude the female aspect of humanity from diplomacy have re-produced nothing more than narcissistic aliens embroiled in despair, fear and horror. Such is the case with a genealogy of diplomacy which begins with the Judaeo-Christian myth of the Fall of Adam and Eve and swiftly moves on to the mutual estrangement among men in the fratricide of Abel and Cain (Der Derian, 1988, p.52), riding roughshod over the prior estrangement between Adam and Eve and omitting completely the story of how male-female alienation is (to be) overcome.

According to Der Derian, the genealogy of diplomacy is a *"history of the present"* and "*like the beginnings of everything great on earth, is soaked in blood thoroughly and for a long time."* (Nietzsche[9]) Hence, female instinct being a "family spirit" is *"thus exempt from the actual world where only (masculine law) human law, is capable of attaining universality"* (Hegel,[10]). Der Derian's post-structuralist account of diplomacy perpetuates macho representations of political reality as unrepentantly violent, anarchic and hideous and continues the logical-positivist tradition which relegate female identity to a matter of domestic and not national, and even less so, international politics. Narrated as a historiography of the alienation of man beginning from pre-historic time right up to the present post-modern era, Der Derian makes no mention of women in his meta-theory of diplomacy as alienation, except that *"ladies figure largely in the process of edification"*. But this is not discussed and instead the single quotation from a feminine source is ascribed to *"an anonymous lady"* and used only to illustrate the point that "Callieres' ladies" contradict the Nicholsonian idea of 'national honesty" and civil manners. (Der Derian pg.91).

Indeed, for postmodern account of diplomacy which purports to be based on biblical parables grounded in the Judaic-Christian tradition, it is peculiar that he fails to mention even the Virgin Mary in his account of Mytho-Diplomacy. Instead, the absence of female is further legitimized by philosophical reminders of *"the inability of women to produce the force of a perfect promise"* (Grotius), for that *"she ridicules the earnest wisdom of mature age"* and that "*she perverts the universal property of the state into a possession and armament for the family"*. But even as women are made invisible, women are made to bear the brunt of wars; for as Der Derian tells it *"women is the everlasting irony of community"* and *"war between imperfect states is a product of femine anarchy"* (Hegel); *"that Oedipus complex for which the woman is responsible"* (Freud)[11]

---

[9] cited by Der Derian, p. 42.
[10] cited by Der Derian, p. 42.
[11] All quoted by Der Derian, pg.42

But feminist diplomacy will resist a genealogy which exclude women and we object to *"the dominance of positivistic and neo-positivistic epistemologies, which have the power to define what counts as an answer to the questions asked by the discipline"* (Smith, 1998), nor even what counts as the right myth to tell about diplomacy. The genealogy which begins with the myth of man as God and ends with the myth of man as Superman, alienates not only women and feminity in diplomacy, but by itself offers no solution to the postmodern dilemma of alienation and estrangement which is the task of diplomacy to mediate. Thus Der Derian's deems it "realistic" to conclude with the postmodern dicta that the solution to alienation *"in a world where everything is dangerous is to identify the gravest danger"* (Foucalt quoted by Der Derian pg. 209) and presumably, to deal with it realistically and in the most manly manner possible. But for a work which aspires to be a Meta-theory of diplomacy, the conclusion is paradoxically anti-diplomacy and Der Derian fails to liberate theory from mythology precisely because he begins and ends with diplomacy as alienation.

"But when a myth reaches the entire community,
it is from the latter that the mythologist must become estranged
if he wants to liberate the myth.
Any myth with some degree of generality is in fact ambiguous
because it represents the very humanity
of those who, having nothing, have borrowed it."

Clearly, diplomacy is not alienation, nor is it estrangement. Neither alienation nor estrangement is constitutive of diplomacy. Rather they are the existential conditions confronting diplomacy. Both are sufficient for diplomacy, but neither is necessary. Diplomacy rise not from alienation, but from a rebellious *besire* (cf. Little,2007; Nussbaum,1986; McDowell 1979) to mitigate estrangement and alleviate alienation. That is why *"we must not replicate the flights of abstract fancy to which much of IR is prone…we must pick up something of the world that IR refuses and thereby acquire some agility in moving in and between the low and common and the high intellectual world of academia, where IR would rather not go because it is insufficiently heroic"* (Sylvester, 1997). Hence, in contrast to the claim that diplomacy necessarily begins and ends with the alienation of man, feminist argue that humanity; and not alienation is the bedrock of diplomacy. That what is necessary is only optimism for love; - the belief that conflicts can be overcome and the desire for a beautiful life.

These are not the frozen words spoken at the UN by professional diplomats; these are the blasphemous riddle of diplomacy when the pillow is wet with the tears, sweat and blood of the female spirit in diplomacy. In this context, the feminist fantasy of a sexual conception of diplomacy as humanity is merely foreplay in order to liberate what would otherwise be an exclusively chauvinistic 'postmodern' discourse of a genealogy of diplomacy which aspires to be a Meta-Theory. Hence, female is the beauty of humanity and painful is the childbirth of diplomacy. But *Feminine diplomacy* is not simply about letting a thousand flowers bloom in IR studies, for this requires complicity with the predominantly macho framework of IR embroiled in the myth of thy motherland, and its offspring of conflict and war (cf Strathern,1984[vii]). Thus, feminism reject as misconceived; a Mytho-diplomacy conceptualized as *"the journey from the womb to the vagina and into a new semiotic chora.."* wherein diplomacy begins from the moment *"the umbilical cord is finally cut, when the somatic link is severed and the newborn is effectively and irrevocably separated from its (m)other"* (Constantinou,1996 p. 114-115). Whilst Der Derian's account of diplomacy as a history of the mediation of alienation suppresses the female identity, Constantinou exploits the female as nothing more but a vessel for the maleness of diplomacy.

"I'm talking strictly professional here.
When women enter; the stage is completely transformed
There is a different sort of chemistry, a different consciousness at play
I am convinced that this is the era of feminism in diplomacy
...and please for goodness sake, whatever you do, promise me,
(You yourself are so intelligent and bright)
Promise me... don't be alone without love in diplomacy
...it can be very lonely."

Ambassador of Mexico, (Male, age 64),
Interview on Diplomacy as practical Philosophy, March 2010

And indeed, the femaleness of diplomacy is a story worth sharing because in s/textualizing diplomacy, a creative space unfolds for healing modern man's estrangement from his primitive Self amidst the manifold strangeness of a mutable and evolving humanity. Thus feminists argue that a Mytho-Diplomacy based on a Herstory of the divine creativity inherent in the conception of humanity, provides a more meaningful value to femaleness in diplomacy and promises a Meta-theory of diplomacy based on female instincts such as love, wisdom, beauty, forgiveness and compromise. Hence feminists prefer a genealogy of

Mytho-diplomacy conceived as the sexual conception of humanity in the submission of power to beauty;- in the love shared between man and woman; and henceforth between the Self and Others.

"Love and Diplomacy? Well yes.
I can say that because I married diplomacy (laughs)
My wife was also a foreign diplomat.
…We are all humans and in the end everyone
Just wants a happy life with their family"

Deputy Head of Mission of The Netherlands (Male, Age 58-62)
Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy, 27 January 2010

But indeed, diplomacy is a familial matter for according to the "Herstorical" myth of diplomacy, humanity conceived in the union between man and woman was embodied in the female and born as a family. Without diplomacy there can be no humanity; for without the alien female; there can be no family of humans. Thus, there can be no humanity without the Other, and no diplomacy without familial ties of humanity.

"Diplomacy begins in the home…..
It is a marriage of culture and religions.
I am a Christian and my wife is a Moslem."

Ambassador of Ethiopia (Male, 54 years old)
Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy, August 2009

And it is easy for us to reject the macho portrayal of diplomatic identity as purely a matter of statecraft, foreign policies and the diplomatic corps, and we shall insist that the first images of diplomacy as humanity is always that of female love, sacrifice, peace and beauty.

"I approached him in the Mosque in my veil... just to surprise him
I thought he would not recognize me with my hair all covered up.
But when he saw me, he simply smiled and said;
"I recognize those beautiful eyes anywhere."
… Now, I doubt that President Bush would have said that to me if I was man"

Ambassador of Malaysia (Female, Muslim, 60 years old)
Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy, October 2009

Hence, if at all a postmodern diplomacy is not a non-fiction; and is more a fantasy life-history caught up in commonsense / (naïve realism) (Tyler, 1986); two fundamental otherness ought to partake in the discourse of diplomacy as meta-narratives; women and aliens;- gender and race/culture. A Meta-Theory based on a meta-narrative which cloaks itself in the voice of post-modernism falls prey to hypocrisy if in pleading for freedom of

representations, freedom from oppressive frameworks, freedom from dominant powers of knowledge; it deliberately exclude feminist or non-western mythologies of diplomacy or recoils in the face of threats from Realpolitik which legitimate by force systematic exclusion of aliens or terrorizing cultures. Indeed, ffeminist diplomatists lament a theoria of diplomacy if it is simply "a quest or adventure" into the unknown, or when it is based on gentlemanly agreement between the postmodernist and his realist protagonist such that to embark on a a journey towards a theory of diplomacy … *"should not involve specific theoretical missions nor precondition for practising it"* or that it is primarily concerned with " a way of *restating language – and not national interest or interstate management- as the primary question of diplomacy"* (Constantinou,1996 p. 64). For feminist diplomatists, the telos of diplomacy is indeed (r)evolution and in the praxis of diplomatic intercourse, painful is the spirit of love and beautiful is the sacrifice. Reciprocity and synchronicity being the dualistic element of creative diplomacy, postmodern feminist practice textualized diplomacy as therapeutic self-alienation amidst competing representations of humanity.

> "I've met some really beautiful women in my line of work
> You know; actresses and movie stars
> But when I start to have a personal chat with them… it all goes away.
> And you realize that the beauty was all something that was in fact put together,
> By the directors, the make-up artists, the script writers…
> what they say, how they look, the music, the whole story plot
> *That* was what created the beauty"

> *High Commissioner of Pakistan (Male, age 64)*
> *Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy, March 2010*

Diplomacy, according to the female fantasy is the being of Self-Otherness which engulfs both Author and Reader in that elusive space between hearing and understanding the multiplicity of sounds which constitute the familiar and the alien. Thus the aim of feminist diplomacy is to reignite the female scent in all its emotional splendour by embedding theoretical account of international diplomacy in the hues of identity, phronesis and rhetorics; or in ethnographic terms; through (s)textualization of the ethics and politics of intra-human, inter-human and international beingness. Henceforth for the diplomatist, diplomacy is the creative process of achieving humane beingness and the linguistic rape of diplomacy (as a word), humanity (as a concept), ethnography (as a method) and sexnography (as praxis) of diplomacy is perpetrated only in order to fully desexualize diplomacy through its swirling vortex until it arrives at "a stillness in the centre" (Tyler,p.133); through textualization of its re-creative duality as the spirit of Self Otherness.

> "Of course there has to be moral in diplomacy.
> One may say that prima facie what does morality
> have to do with somebody who's trying to sell golden (pause) …
> how should I say (pause) … lies to people.

This is not the case. Diplomacy has to be moral.
A job of a diplomat has to be a moral job.
...I believe that without moral, even diplomacy ...
that diplomacy is less (pause)...
how shall I say (long pause)...
...*Fruitful*; to use this word and nothing else.
Bears no good fruit.

Ambassador of Greece, (Male Age 62)
Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy, September 2009

Thus the mythology of diplomacy as a female fantasy ends with textualization of diplomacy as a post-modern, auto-ethnography of diplomacy.

V.   (Mytho) Diplomacy in the Postmodern discourse

In the midst of scholarly dilemmas of a purported disciplinar crisis blamed on the absence of theories of diplomacy (Wight, 1966; Der Derian,1987;Constantinou,1996;Sharp,1999 & 2008; Murray,2008; Hoffman,2003, Jonnson & Hall,2005; et al) recent attempts at geneologizing a Meta-Theory of diplomacy have raised the spectre of post-modernist intrusion into IR studies. But *"even as truth is stranger than fiction, so myth may be more uniform than history"*[iii]; hence a three-fold postmodern mythology of diplomacy as re-alienation (Der Derian), as mediation of estrangement (Constantinou) and as humanity in mediation of alienation/estrangement, each of which conceive the genesis of diplomacy in biblical parables. Three alternative framework for a Meta-Theory of diplomacy:- post-structuralism, postmodernism and feminism; each located within the problematic of the static and statist nature of traditional realist-positivistic discourse and each claiming authority over an arguably ethnographic phenomena of "Otherness", forms an interesting post-modern complex which requires "diplomatizing".

But the status of Meta-Theory within postmodern narratives is itself a vexed issue, for the postmodernist is inclined to distance himself from the conceit of asserting a meta-narrative which would encompass 'the Story of stories' or 'the hypostatized whole' (Tyler,1986). Thus the oxymoron of a postmodern Meta-theory of diplomacy needs to be investigated, for as Tyler warns us the postmodern ethnography begins and ends with concepts and there is always an underlying purpose. Hence, a brief deliberation of the rhetoric's in the meta-discourse surrounding these competing postmodern 'meta-theory of diplomacy' may be the first step towards a truly postmodern ethnography of diplomacy as a phenomenology of beingness between the Self and Other, whomsoever the aliens may be.

According to Der Derian "*Since Alienation theory itself is "the measure of the alienated world (Marx)" it is inseparable from the struggles for truth in the diplomatic discourse*" (Der Derian, p.6). But a Meta-theory of diplomacy which is grounded in a postmodern theory of alienation is prima facie anti-diplomacy and while it may be true that diplomacy is an epi-phenomena which is at once implicated in the phenomenon of alienation and estrangement, it is not necessarily the case that diplomacy is constitutive of alienation. Certainly, the concept of diplomacy as an upshot of alienation is misguided when what purports to be a Meta-theory of diplomacy amounted to nothing more but a conceptualization of diplomacy as part of the 'ahistorical' condition of human alienation. "*This began, and shall end, as a genealogy of problems – not solutions – posed by alienation...Diplomacy seems as resistant to remedy as it is to theory...*" (Der Derian, p. 208). Hence, in one fell swoop, we are deprived of both the possibility of a theory of diplomacy and diplomacy itself. On Der Derian's account diplomacy is not at all a solution or therapy to alienation as it pretends to be, but rather an ailment in itself. Traditional notions of diplomacy as a fundamentally peaceful, honest and reconciliatory activity is completely annihilated and all that remains is a vicious upwards spiral of alienation and re-alienation as the foundation and fate of human beingness. This is the first error: the idea that diplomacy is inseparable from alienation; and representations of diplomacy, not as a solution, but as symptoms of alienation.

> "The diplomatic profession is like that of medicine.
> We should think of diplomacy as though it is a human body
> We should look at it with a microscopic view and from a 360 degrees angle
> The diplomat is charged with diagnosing and healing the ailments of diplomacy"
>
> *Ambassador of Ethiopia, (Male, 54 years old)*
> *Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy, August 2009*

Alas, in the single-minded theorizing of diplomacy as a purportedly intra-human, inter-human and international phenomena of alienation and/or estrangement (Der Derian,1987 Constantinou,1996), a Meta-theory of diplomacy will persist in eluding our longing for meta-paradigms for as long as post-modernism fail to develop a discourse of diplomacy which emancipate itself from theories of alienation and estrangement, and for as long as diplomatic discourse continue to alienate the aliens which confirm our estrangement. Indeed, failing to liberate the concept of diplomacy from his theory of alienation, Der Derian was forced to conclude that **"*our greatest need reflects our gravest danger: until we learn how to recognize ourselves as the Other, we shall be in danger and we shall be in need of diplomacy"* (pg. 209). This is indeed an ironic paradox; an empty rhetoric; and thus deserving the status of a grand conclusion for what portrays itself as a postmodern meta-theory of diplomacy as alienation. At this point it is useful to recall the postmodern warnings concerning philosophy and the creation of concepts:

> "A concept lacks meaning to the extent that it is not connected
> to other concepts and is not linked to a problem
> that it resolves or helps to resolve[ix].
> …Confusing concept and proposition,the philosophical concept
> usually appears only as a proposition deprived of sense.
> We are constantly trapped between two alternative
> propositions and do not see that the concept
> has already passed into the excluded middle."[x]

Deleuze & Guattari (1994)
"What is a concept" & "Conceptual Personae"

Der Derian's need to formulate a conceptual relationship between diplomacy and alienation once and for all in an archetypal logico-philosophical proposition which unifies all his typographical propositions of Mytho, Proto, Neo and Anti-diplomacy as forms of alienation, could not but fail to manifest itself as a tautology. And a rather sneaky, if not fraudulent one at that. For at the end of a long genealogical contemplation into the historical mirror of diplomacy as alienation; when the mask is pulled back, we see only the face of an alien Self; "*ourselves as the Other*" (p.209), that is;- the Self as alienated aliens. Indeed, self identity as simply re-assertion of "Otherness", is truly a self-alienating act, especially if after a thoroughly purifying self-alienation, the issue ends; not with how shall we mediate our estrangement from Other(s); but how shall we cope with dangers confronting our alienation (Der Derian,p.209). Viewing diplomacy as a mirror-reflection of alienation is reminiscent of the anguish to distinguish-extinguish the Self in order to pander to the disease of alienation. Narcissism, Terror & Paranoia: that is the image which reflects in the eyes of an alienated and self-alienating Self. Hence, Der Derian's genealogy of diplomacy which begins and ends with the myth of man's alienation failed to break free from the vicious cycle of erecting authority upon insecurity, and he concludes that in a dangerous world*, "we need to determine which is the main danger"* for "*how does one live according to reason if the other, the alien, the foreigner whether remote or nearby may burst into one's world at any moment?"* [xi](Der Derian p. 8). According to the logic of Der Derian's metaphysics of Self vision, diplomacy is alienating because diplomacy reflects alienation, and thus there is no option but to adopt a re-alienating diplomacy. This is the second error: diplomacy as self-inflation and re-alienation.

Hence his proposal for diplomacy is not the overcoming of alienation, that is; not de-alienation, but rather re-alienation whereby the Self is now postulated as "the Other". Not in the relativist sense of the "Others as us", but in the subjectivist sense of "ourselves as an Other"; the Self re-alienated as an Other; into a self-assured object which re-assures its identity through vigilant assertion of its foreignness to Others. Hence, his erroneous formulation of 'Crypto-Techno' diplomacy which would mediate estrangement from Others through a towering monument of the Self as the "*Panopticon of omniscience and*

omnipotence" (Der Derian, p.208) Thus Der Derian's theory of diplomacy which begins and ends with Self discourse as the foundation for interaction with Others portrays diplomacy as merely a symptom of alienation which reflects the inevitability of estrangement, wherein postmodern diplomacy becomes merely a self–defensive reaction to the loneliness and madness of alienation. This is the third error; the Self as a distinct Other, and diplomacy as the subjective objectifications of alienation and re-alienation.

Diplomacy is certainly not limited to only what theorist in UK and USA are saying
And diplomacy is certainly not that English saying "a gentleman's agreement"
First of all it excludes women and all others who are not "gentlemen"
And secondly what is this "secret" agreement?

So I hope you will show them this video of us. Let them see;
"Look, here is a (female) Malaysian and a Mexican diplomat speaking about diplomacy.
and "We" are not written in the walls".

<div align="right">

Ambassador of Mexico, (Male, age 64),
Interview on Diplomacy as practical Philosophy, March 2010

</div>

Diplomacy should not be a project of re-alienation for the purpose of Self-inflation. That is the psychotic dream of a Techno diplomacy which deploys para-diplomacy, media-diplomacy and crypto diplomacy from *"a central tower which allow permanent surveillance of a circle of confined individuals without requiring overt or violence or standard of judgment"* and which would oversee the boundaries of the territorial Self, against external dangers identified as "*that confrontation between East and West"* through a *"vigilantism"* as "*a constant suspicion of wrong doing and a readiness to inflict instant if not always "legal" justice", against this year's Other: the imperialist, communist and now, more than ever before, terrorist"* (Der Derian, p.207) While there is nothing objectionable about the project of identifying common historical-political-religious structures in the evolution of western civilization in order to re-create a cultured Self, one wonders how a towering monument of the 'God-Self' not but be a symbol of proud alienation, of cherished estrangement from others outside the circle of the Self.

Lest we differentiate territorial boundaries between Self and Other base on self delusions, we must engage Others in the process of identifying the Self, and even diplomacy as alienation must include the alienating Others in its discourse and re-charting of the Self. This is the first requirement for an ethnography of diplomacy; participatory and emancipatory text; as oppose to an alienating discourse in the form of negative dialectics in the construction of a Self image of diplomacy. *"It may be true that all textualization is alienation, but it is certainly true that non-participatory textualization is alienation – "not us" – and there is no therapy in alienation"* (Tyler, pg 128)

The image of the self is reflected in the eye and inscripted in the voice of the Other. The Self manifest itself most satisfyingly in its relation to the Other; that is- the Self as a reflexion of its image through the eye of the Other, and *not* as the self-image in the mirror of the Self. To mirror the Self in one's own reflection is to perpetuate alienation; to cut off all other possible world. In contrast, to mirror the self through the eyes of the other is to de-alienate the self in relation to the Other; to bring forth possible worlds. Hence, it is certainly not true that the struggle for truth in diplomatic discourse is a struggle 'of' alienation or 'for' re-alienation of the Self as portrayed by Der Derian. It is fundamentally because diplomacy is a de-alienating phenomena that it can act as a measure of the alienated Self; and it is precisely because it is a mitigation of estrangement that it is de-alienating. Hence, diplomacy is both alienating and de-alienating. Alienating in so far that it is entrapped within the alienating discourse of the Self which finds itself in the communion of the unknown (the Otherless, the Self-Other and the Other-Self). And de-alienating in so far that within the discourse of the Self, it reaches out into possible worlds through Self-lessness and Self-Otherness.

> Man has no internal sovereign territory;
> he is all and always on the boundary;
> looking within himself, he looks in the eyes of the other
> or through the eyes of the other"

> Mikhail Bakhtin, The Problems of Dostoevsky's Work[xii]

Self-alienation is required in order for the Self to converse with the **Self-Other** (that is: the other of the Self; the projected image of the Self; the reflection, the double or the shadow behind the Self) in the internal dialogue between consciousness and sub-consciousness. This is the nature of self knowledge; of identity and of reflexive beliefs. De-alienation on the other hand is discovered through conversing with the Other; when the Self reveals itself as both subject and object; when the "I" is not inseparable from the Self[12], when the Other is itself a special subject, and when the Self as the "I" in the "I myself" is re-discovered through the Other as a "Self-otherness". This then is the de-alienated self.

> "Another person[autrui]...- a subject that presents itself as an object –
> which is specific in relation to the self; they are two components.
> In fact if the other person is identified with a special object,
> it is now the other subject as it appears to me;
> and if we identify it with another subject,
> it is me who is the person as I appear to that subject"[13]

---

[12] Deleuze & Guattari, 1994,p. 32
[13] Deleuze & Guattari (1994) What is a concept, pg 16

Diplomacy occurs not when the Self finally and completely de-alienate itself from the Self-Other or from the Otherless for this kind of annihilation is impossible. This would amount to a complete de-fragmentation of Self-identity. This is to confuse the Otherless with the Self-other; the spirit with the soul; God with human, attributes with essence. No, but de-alienation is mere deferral of differences, oppositions, conflicts and contradictions. It is not a permanent state the way alienation is. Alienation from the Other-less (the One) is a pre-condition of human being, just as the duality of humankind; the Self and Self-Other is the primary axis of self-identity. By themselves they cannot constitute the foundation of diplomacy and it is through triangulation of these epi-phenomena with the Other; that the **Other-Self** is to be found in order for **Self-Otherness** to emerge as diplomacy.

> "The Other Person is always perceived as an other,
> but in its concept, it is the condition for our passing
> from one world to another.
> The Other Person makes the world go by,
> and the "I" now designates only a past world
> ("I was peaceful")"
>
> *Deleuze & Guattari (1994)*
> *"What is a concept?" Pg. 18*

But in this epi-phenomenon of diplomacy as a reflexive process of self-alienation and de-alienation, the Other is not derived from the Self, but rather the Self is derived from the Other; and thus a de-alienated Self is reborn. By de-alienating the Self in relation to the 2nd person, the Self adopts the view of the Other as an extension of the Self. The other Self (the 2nd person) becomes an "I" in the "I, myself"; that is the Other is appropriated as an Other-Self, wherein the Self-other is then able to transcend into a Self-Otherness; into diplomacy. The world is multiplied, alienation is deferred or diminished; and estrangement is mediated. Hence diplomacy is a sense of "Self-love" in all humanity, as oppose to the alienating love of the "I myself" (Derrida,1967), and a diplomatic presence is a divine beingness which measures the dignity of the Self in its relation to Others. Hence, de-alienation is not just the discourse of the Reflexive Self (between the Self and Self- Other). No, but that it involves reducing the Self and making space for the Other-Self to emerge through diplomacy as de-alienation and mediation of estrangement from Others. Diplomacy as an epi-phenomenon of Self-Otherness which involves the doubling of presence and life-worlds, evokes a renewed reality between the Self and Other that is both de-alienating and re-humanizing. Hence, the struggle for diplomacy is the struggle for living. Reaching out for life and embracing the daunting ir-realities of the Self and Others. It is a way of duplicating and multiplying consciousness, not alienating and truncating consciousness. This is the first requirement of a post-modern Meta-theory of diplomacy; duplicity in the duality of human nature.

> "The other person requires an a priori concept from which the special object, the
> other subject, and the self must all derive, not the other way around...
> The other person is the existence of a possible world."

Deleuze & Guattari (1994)
"What is a concept?" Pg. 16-17

Thus, feminists argue that alienation is not merely inescapable, but that it is essentially both deferred and deferred to in the mediation of estrangement between Self and Other. That in between the tragic condition of a primordial alienation and estrangement, there exist love and friendship, peace and beauty. It is in this context that a Herstory of Diplomacy demands to be told as an integral part of the geneologizing of diplomacy, and an ethnographic method towards a theory of diplomacy is a means for including alien voices, alien forms and alien tales from beyond the frontiers of western civilization. In the feminist mythology, diplomacy did not emerge with or from alienation, but is in all respect subsequent to alienation. True diplomacy is not an alienating danger nor a dangerous alienation, and thus not a hole to be penetrated and certainly not that metaphysical caesura from which one plunges the Self into an upward spiral of re-alienation.

According to the female fantasy, diplomacy is a novice, a present/ce in its own right. As a divine gift of creativity and humanity, diplomacy is the filling in of the void between alienation and estrangement. It is the ruptures and breaches within alienation and estrangement. It is the healing moments, the rest and pauses within alienation when the Other exist to make the world go by, when estrangement is mediated and Self-love predominates over love of the "I myself". When the Other is found in the Self, when alienation is no-longer menacing but forgotten, forgiven or deferred awhile in the presence of a mediating divinity which re-creates and re-humanizes the Self.Diplomacy being the opposite of alienation and only half way between estrangement; is both de-alienating and re-humanizing. And in that sense, postmodern feminism is post postmodernism, because in seeking to overcome alienation through mediation of estrangement between Self and Self-other; and Self and Other, it is at once re-creative and therapeutic. That is the first requirement for a auto-ethnography of diplomacy as an epi-phenomena between Self and Other(s): Diplomacy as creative mediation and auto-ethnography as therapeutic textualization of diplomacy in the discourse between Self and Others.

> " The post-modern ethnography is a cooperatively evolved text consisting of
> fragments of discourse intended to evoke in the minds of reader and writer an
> emergent fantasy of a possible world of commonsense reality, and thus to provoke
> an aesthetical integration that will have a therapeutic effect.
> It is, in a word, poetry..."

(Tyler, Post-modern Ethnography, p. 125)

Indeed diplomacy is an *adianoeta*, for we are dealing here with alienation as a double phenomenon; of estrangement of the Self from the Otherless One; and estrangement from Others like the Self (Constantinou, 1996). Diplomacy being derived from the primordial duality immanent in human beingness;-of the God-human paradigm, of the male-female dimension, of the Self-Other axis, of the conscious-subconscious divide, of pre-conscious and non-conscious states, is a duplicity operating between alienation as a double estrangement within the Self, and as between two or more beings. Hence, it is not just the relationship between Self and Other which comprise the diplomatic phenomena. No, but in its re-creative being; in the becoming of Self-Otherness, diplomacy is a duplication which emerge from triangulation of (duplicitous) viewpoints from the alienated Self (the lonely "I" as against the Absolute One), from the Self-alienated (the double "I"; the "I, myself" as both Self and Self-Other) and from the de-alienated self (the "I" as the "Other-Self") in relation to the estranged Other (the 2nd person which refracts the point of view of the first) and for which the same diplomatizing process takes place.

Diplomacy is that epi-phenomena of reciprocal and simultaneous triangulation between external alienation (between the Self and God, and the Self and Others) and internal estrangement (between the Self and the Otherless, the Self and the Self-Other; and the Self and the Other-Self). As diplomacy encompasses both sides of the temporal divide where alienation is a double predicament and estrangement is its correlate inwards and outwards, and vice versa for the second person, the diplomatic discourse must therefore be doubled, tripled and multiplied to its point of saturation. This is the first requirement a post-modern Meta-theory of diplomacy; multiplicity of possible worlds inherent in the duplicity of the duality of human nature. We can see now that at this stage; in this chaotic proliferation of 'beings' or 'beingness' as manifested in the plurality of the "I myself" as Self, Self-Other and Other-Self, and in the Other as object, subject and special subject, diplomacy as an epi-phenomena between two or more persons manifest itself as variations of the multiplicity of Self-Otherness, wherein the Otherless is somehow lost. Or rather, the Otherless becomes insignificant in relation to the active "I" which mutates into Self-Otherness; wherein what remains from the "I myself" minus the Otherless is the lonely "I dn't know"; the Selflessness within the "I myself".

> "It is only when the multiple is treated as a substantive, "multiplicity", that it ceases to have any relation to the One as subject or object, natural or spiritual reality, image and world....The notion of unity (unit'e) appears only when ..there is a pivot unity forming the basis for a set of biunivocal relationsips between objective elements or points, or for the One that divides following the law of a binary logic of differentiation in the subject. Unity always operates in an empty dimension supplementary to that of the system considered (overcoding)."
>
> *Deleuze & Guattari (1987)* "A Thousand Plateaus" pg. 9

But when Pandora's box is opened and when possible worlds presents itself, one have little control over the explosive or refractive consequences which may ensue and postmodernism may find itself driven to complicity with the ethos of the very framework of realist-positivism which they sought to undermine. Hence, some have rest content in affirming the postmodern era by alienating themselves further from the aliens from whom they need to assert their identity, instead of de-alienating and embracing foreignness and thus moving beyond postmodernism (as alienation and re-alienation) to diplomatism (as de-alienation and re-humanization). Looking for the origin of diplomacy in the postmodern de-centring discourse of self-alienation and re-alienation is like falling into a black hole, and spiralling upwards into anarchy and chaos. Especially if Self dicourse is limited to the Self-Other, to the exclusion of the Other as the Other-Self, or the Otherless as the divine-Self. Indeed, the self-alienating discourse of an alienated Self will produce no more but a re-alienated Self, which by excluding others inevitably loses sight of its primordial nature both as a human and as a divine being. In this context, the 'alienating and re-alienating' Self is a supra-complex extra-terrasterial being which is constantly purging itself from both its inner and external space, hence plunging deeper into an unknowing knowingness.

By suppressing the Other and the Otherless, diplomacy becomes simply a matter of self inflation wherein the Self becomes a God unto himself and thereupon; a Master unto his Others. Without de-alienation from the Other and Otherless, 'alienation and re-alienation' is simply duplicity in denying the dual nature of human beingness. By producing duplicitous duplications of a diluting human essence and multiplying objectifications of inter-subjectivities as mere relativity of viewpoints without a fix axis, diplomacy rapidly loses its divine stature and becomes simply a phenomena of social power and intellectual rhetorics. Thus, diplomacy is not as Constantinou claims; *"primarily and constitutvely intersubjective"* (Constantinou, pg. 112). No, but it would probably be more accurate to describe it as being essentially intra-subjective. That is, as simultaneously involving the Self-Other and the Other–Self. Furthermore, it is similarly false that "*diplomacy occurs only (and this is a very big only) at the point where these subjectivities become politicized, and politicized to the extent of being capable or having the status of diplomatic relations.*" (Constantinou pg. 112) No, for that diplomacy is not only intra-human, it is as well extra-human; involving de-alienation of the Self with the divine Otherless and therefore not just political, but ethical and intra-subjectively ethical to the extent that the **divine-Self** evoke the moral aspect of diplomacy from the viewpoint of the known (de-alienated) Otherless.

Self-alienation or de-alienation with the Self-Other is the exercise of reflexivity and self-authentication which results in the Selfness of the Ego. On the other hand, de-alienation with the Other-Self in mitigating estrangement from the Other, is a humanizing process of diplomacy as Self-Otherness which can be either re-humanizing or re-alienating, depending

on the degree and types of self-alienation and de-alienaton that takes place between two or more persons, each according to his own Self reflexivity,humanity and divinity. The point is, between alienation and re-alienation there is de-alienation, and within Self de-alienation there is the Other and the Otherless; and therefore the possibility of Self-Otherness and Self-lessness. Thus, between the alternative of re-alienation or re-humanization, there is a choice, or rather multiple choices. But in this context, without discourse with the Otherless within the Self; without de-alienation with the Otherless; beauty and love, and with it, wisdom and justice is out of reach; and divine humanity is lost. Thus, post postmodernism takes the position that alienation is not merely inescapable, but that it is essentially both deferred and deferred to in the mediation of estrangement. That in between the tragic condition of a doubling alienation and estrangement which result in duplicity and multiplicity of truths; in alienation and re-alienation; and in the subjectifications of objectification and objectifications of subjectivism, there exist love and hope. There exists diplomacy. Diplomacy as a besire for the simple sake of justice and wisdom, whereby de-alienation from the Otherless produces a divining presence of Self-lessness which permeates the re-humanizing process of diplomacy as the Self-Otherness between Self and Others.

Diplomacy as a will to truth, is the struggle to de-alienate the Self in order to mitigate internal estrangement of the Self with the Self-Other, Other-Self and the Otherless which exist always as a potentiality within the fragmented unity of the Self as the "I myself". De-alienation from the Otherless which results in Selflessness need not lead to dejection and helplessness in confronting the limiting possibilities of knowledge, just like de-alienation from the Other need not lead to chaos and confusion concerning the probabilities of knowledge. The truth is; both Self-lessness and Self-Otherness is within the powers of the Self and tru(c)e diplomacy perceives the multiplicity of duplicitous truths through an honest admission of this innate Self-lessness & Self-Otherness in the lifeworld of the "I myself". Thus, the struggle for diplomacy is the struggle for self honesty in the postmodern Self discourse; for simplicity of the Self as a unitary being; and for simple truths in the manifold brilliance of a world of receding and multiplying truths. And the struggle for truth in diplomatic discourse is the struggle for the *tru(c)e* in competing representations of truths. This is the first requirement of a post-modern auto-ethnography of diplomacy:- diplomatism as Self truce in perceiving the multiplicity of duplicitous truths which recognizes the reciprocal fragmentation of the Self, the Other and the Otherless as subject, object and special subject, wherein diplomacy as a divinely human potentiality is the imperfect perfecting of divine humanity.

V.   A Postmodern Auto-Ethnography of Diplomacy

The notion of 'diplomacy as philosophy' may be just as ludicrous to the professional diplomat, as the idea of 'philosophy as envois' (Derrida, 1982[xiii]) is to the metaphysicians, or as the idea of 'theory as diplomacy or diplomacy as *theoria*' (Constantinou, 1998) is to the realist-positivist schools of diplomacy. True, but "*in truth, reflexivity calls for overturning the politics of theorizing by making theoretical language less authoritarian and more negotiable*" (Fuller,1988). An auto-ethnography of diplomacy narrated by a tyro diplomatist in collaboration with professional diplomats, grounded in a 'diplomatism' of the truce of truths in representations of Self, Other and Self-Otherness has all the makings of what Tyler (1986) describes as the occult document; - a post-modern ethnography. It will be rhetorical not only because it seeks a participatory text through multi-vocality and polyphonic text (Denzin, 2009, Tyler, 1986), nor merely because it is auto-ethnographic and thus cannot but manifest authorial voice, but rhetorical also because rhetorics is the form of discourse and duplicitous is the phenomena under study. Diplomacy is not just "*part of the discursive construction and constitution of the political, not just politicized, but politicizing*" (Constantinou, p.112).

But the duality of alienation and estrangement in the phenomena of diplomacy must not be reduced to mere duplicity such that a postmodern meta theory of diplomacy is presented as a synthesizing whole in propositions like 'political-diplomacy', 'alienating diplomacy' or 'theoria diplomacy'. Left to the political linguist, diplomacy becomes a double edge sword where in the hands of '*hermes*'; in the textual transition of diplomacy from being an intra-human, inter-human and finally international phenomena, diplomacy rapidly loses its divinity as a moral virtue and is swiftly abducted by political discourse which neutralizes its essence until what purportedly began as a phenomena for mediating political discourse becomes itself a weapon of political discourse; diplomacy as mere rhetoric; as "war by other means". Thus, the necessary dependence and impossible coincidence of philosophy and politics (Foucault, 2008) makes us wary of half baked postmodern meta-theory which ultimately cower to the bifurcation of theory and practice in the realm of realpolitiks by reducing *Theoria* to simply a matter of language and diplomatic practice as merely rhetoric. Similarly, we are anxious of post structuralism parading itself as post-modernism in order to reconvert the infidels of modernity by entrapping itself in a re-alienating diplomacy which further estrange the Other from the Self. Hence, a*n auto-ethnography* of diplomacy which finds its voice in the conceptual personae of feminism grounded in diplomatism, is an attempt to recapture the ancient ethnographic significations of "ethos", "ethnos" and ethics" (Tyler, 1986) in the postmodern meta-discourse of diplomacy.

Feminist diplomatism is motivated by simple faith in love, wisdom and beauty in confronting the tragedy and ironies of the postmodern condition;- that alienation and estrangement from an originary unity which have vanished into a multiple world of virtual ir-realities. In the feminist auto-ethnography of diplomacy, the discourse; the phenomena; and the art we are engaged in is one which pursues dialectical truth through rhetorical means. That is; a kind of psychogagy which persuades others by persuading itself. Hence, a postmodern auto-ethnography of diplomacy is a Self-subjectivistic discourse of truth whereby the text is constantly testing and playing out the Self and Other, Author and Reader, Text and Subject. It will be rhetorical for the sake of dialectical truth, but diplomatic in enunciating a subjectivist view of diplomacy. Humbling in its rhetorical acceptance of the multiplicity of truths and yet empowering in its dialectical performance of a subjectivistic truth. It is a philosophical truth-telling or what Foucalt terms as philosophical *parrèsia* (Foucalt,2008) a discourse which takes a step back from the alienating rhetoric of political diplomacy, yet itself professing an immanent code of values where its objective its less to persuade others than to persuade itself through the beauty of simplicity and spontaneity of form in the subject of discourse. "Through letting the subject speak itself" (Foucalt,p.327).

"The concept is not given, it is created..-it is a self-positing. Creation and self-positing mutually imply each other because what is truly created, from the living being to the work of art, thereby enjoys a self-positing of itself, or an autopoetic characteristic by which it is recognized. ...What depends on a free creative activity is also that which independently and necessarily, posits itself in itself: the most subjective will be the most objective"

Deleuze & Guattari (1994) "The Question Then ..." Pg. 11

An auto-ethnography of diplomacy based on a postmodern meta-theory of diplomacy as "Self-Otherness" aims for a (s)textualization and de(s)textualization of diplomacy through a creative process of bringing forth the essence of humanity by revealing its embedded sense and meanings in the phenomenology of diplomacy as a divine and creative human experience whose multiple possibility manifest itself through variations in modes of beingness resulting from interaction between two or more beings. An auto-ethnography of diplomacy as a post-modern textualization re-creates the evolutionary processes of diplomacy wherein Self-Otherness (and Self-lessness) emerge only if one can endure the cumbersomeness, exhaustion and anxiety involved in nurturing to full term a parasitic

being, which is both Self and Other; subject, object & special subject/object as triangulated between Text–Author-Reader. In this manner, the postmodern auto-ethnography of diplomacy shares the predicament of a pregnant woman in the eyes of the male. An alienating reminder of the embarrassing originary state of humans as an alien being; a being within a being and nothing more but a mesh of slime clinging on to a seed, brought forth from a dirty cave through sweat, tears and blood. Yet the (t)issue is not the image, rather it is only the reminder and allusions of humanization and re-humanization, or maybe for some; alienation and re-alienation. Does this humbling thought image reminds one of love or beauty or pleasure in the act itself; or does it bring image of horror, despair and contempt?

"If creation were not revelation, what would happen to
the finitude of the writer and to the solitude of the hand that God abandon?
Divine creativity in this case would be re-appropriated to a hypocritical humanism
If writing is inaugural, it is not so because it creates,
but because of a certain absolute freedom of speech
Because of the freedom to bring forth the already-there
as a sign of the freedom to augur"".

Jacques Derrida, "Essay on the Origin of Language"
Writing and Difference, 1974 p.12

Diplomacy is just one of the many attributes of the human spirit which are ephemeral, transcending and yielding multiple representations, experiences and aesthetics for those involved. Just as sexual pleasure is a matter of taste, so too is the post-modern auto-ethnography. Both is a re-creative process which involve the doubling, triangulating and duplication of the Self in order to arouse a being of Self-Otherness (and Self-lessness) which resonates through the Self. This is the sexual phantasm of the postmodern diplomatist; a mythical fantasy of the re-incarnation of diplomacy as love, wisdom, peace and justice, wherein "we are engaged in an orgy of discovery, exploration and "invention" of the Other" (Baudrillard, 1990). That is why the postmodern narrative is fascinated by divinities trapped in the uneasy tension between words, concepts, theories, and paradigms as experienced in the phenomenology of writing, reading, hearing and speaking the voices of diplomacy. As an attempt to transcend the spatio-temporal history of mankind and the cultural-religious artefacts of human civilizations by re-creating the epi-phenomena of diplomacy between Text, Author & Reader, an auto-ethnography of diplomacy is a de-alienating and re-humanizing process which may be dubbed as a postmodern sexnography of diplomacy.

"Auto-affection constitutes the same (auto) as it divides the same. In as much as it puts into play the presence of the present and the life of the living, the movement of language does not, one suspects, have only an analogical relationship with "sexual"

auto-affection. It is totally indistinguishable from it, even if that totality is severely articulated and differentiated"

Jacques Derrida, "Essay on the Origin of Language"
Of Grammatology, 1974 p.167

This is a postmodern auto-ethnography of diplomacy as an epi-phenomena, where the object and subjects of discourse are the philosophizing diplomats and the diplomatizing philosophers textualized as the alienating self-Other, through a dialectical and dialogical intercourse of diplomacy as a phenomena of Self-Otherness (and Self-lessness) which appear in the Scribe; that Mystic Pad (Derrida, 1967) which is triangulated between Author-Text-Reader. This is diplomacy philosophized and (s)textualized as a postmodern auto-ethnographic process. It is not fiction because it is grounded in naïve realism and is derived from real data and real subjects. But neither is it based simply on a non-fiction commonsense. Certainly not when its ontology is derived from a mythical genealogy; not also because it is bound by *diplomatics* as the art of interpreting diplomatic writings (cf. Constantinou 1996), wherein *diplomatism* implies a blasphemous 'truce in truths', and not least because textualization even when participatory, escapes the control of both the original voices and transcriber into the foreignness of the Scribe. But now, if *"Ethnography is the discourse of the postmodern world"* (Tyler,1986,pg.123) as a totalizing condition of alienation and estrangement; and if therefore an auto-ethnography of diplomacy is a postmodern meta-discourse of diplomacy as an alienating phenomena, then a *postmodern auto-ethnography* of diplomacy as an epi-phenomena which is both de-alienating and re-humanizing; is post postmodernism. This is therefore more accurately; a creative non-fiction where data and text, field experience and 'writing-up', author and text, subject and object merge to convey diplomatic experience through a performatism (cf. Eshelman, 2008; Willis & Bochner, 1996; Coffey 1999) which re-enacts the phenomena of diplomacy as a *divine* Self-Otherness.

Diplomacy as a divine presence of 'Self-otherness' manifest itself simultaneously in the brief and fleeting space when alienation is deferred and estrangement mediated; that is at the ahistorical moment when the Self-being is re-stored through a process of self-alienation, de-alienation and re-humanization. But as Self-Otherness is itself a multiplicity, according to the postmodernist this "transcendental transit"; this "synoptic transcendence"; "is neither immanent in the post-modern text nor the exclusive right of the author, being instead the functional interacation between text-author-reader", and is "*evoked [only] to accomplish a cognitive utopia of ... an emergent mind that has no individual locus, being instead an infinity of possible loci*"[xiv](Tyler). But, whilst postmodernism refrain from practicing synthetic transcendence in the text, preferring instead to end with a spiraling and expanding reality of anarchy and multiplicity immanent in alienation wherein deconstruction offers a refuge in the permeability of language to de-center meanings from

an originary context (cf Derrida, 1967) post postmodernism is a return to the stillness and silence of fictional transcendence which promises an aesthetical experience of the subject in its multiple possibilities as it re-emerges or is aroused in the interpretive performance between text, author and reader (Eshelman,2001). Whilst postmodernism eschew representations, post postmodernism goes even further by evoking subjectivistic representation of the subject through simulation of the phenomena (the subject) as the object(ive) of discourse. Knowledge through experience, wisdom through creativity and beauty in being; this is Performatism. Diplomacy as a divine Self-Otherness "*rather than [being] justified in epistemological or argumentative terms, is simply performed: it is presented to the viewer as a narrative fact that must either be disbelieved or believed*" (Eshelman,2001). This is diplomacy as practical philosophy; as phrónêsis and aesthetics (Eikeland,2008); as *parrèsia* (Foucalt, 2008).

An auto-ethnography of diplomacy as a postmodern condition is therefore already an occult document because by virtue of its uncensored censorship, representations of diplomacy persistently elude homogeneous textualization, comprising instead of fragmentary images abducted from wholes (Tyler,1986); and promoting a re-creative understanding of diplomacy in the 'sexualisation' and 'de-sexualization' of beingness between Author-Text–Reader. Whilst, in the postmodern discourse, the Otherless; the One; the unifying transcendence is repressed and subjugated in the narration of duplicity, synchronicity and multiplication, where the originary hole or the caesura of transcendence leads neither to a climax a climax, nor a perfecting synthesis. Instead, the emergence of transcendence is deliberately held in suspense just long enough until desire becomes impotent and the alienated Self collapses and repeats the play of alienating and re-alienating the Self. Madness and masturbation. Negative dialectics is merely foreplay to the neurotic deseaese of postmodernism, and in so far that postmodern precludes (s)textualisation of synthetic transcendence, it promotes masturbation of the Author and eroticizing of the Reader without closure; that is without a de-sexualization which restores the Self to the "I myself". A wet dream; a spiralling, de-centring strategic plot, nothing but a delusion of a promised transcendence: a pornography. In contrast, in performatism, fictional transcendence is both embodied and performed in the text, wherein "a successful performance depends on the unforced will of an authorially framed subject and not on the author himself" (Enselman, 2001), and especially not from the author who whilst pandering the Self-Other, suppresses the Other-Self and Otherless from a discourse of the Self and in effect severing the sexual ties between Reader & Text.

Whilst the synoptic transit of postmodernism is a non-synthetic transcendence that is evoked by, and not immanent in the text (Tyler, pg.132), in Performatism the subject-object of fictional transcendence which is simulated between Text–Author-Reader is neither

immanent nor absent from the text. It is simply hidden, lost or repressed in the narrative. It is in fact the elusive theme of the story, which persistently rears its head from time to time in order to impress its non–present and ever present reality on the reader. Indeed, in the triangulation between text–author-reader;- the Otherless, the Other-Self and the Self-Other permeates throughout the discourse, folds over itself and find echoes in the internal dialogue of the de-alienated Self. Hence whilst the 'anti-theoretical subject'[xv] of diplomacy in the postmodern ethnography remains opaque or fragmentary;- diplomacy as a fiction, a fantasy, a thesis of diplomacy as adulation, adámas[xvi], *adianoeta*, whatever; post postmodernism opens the space between Text and Reader, and enables performatism of diplomacy as a vision of Alethia; of truth, and beauty, and wisdom. Whilst postmodernism refrain from positing a Story of stories, performatism embeds The Love Story into tales within the stories. It is a kind of discourse which "*alters the nature of the audience, the range of readership and the kinds of interactions between author and reader, and alters the subject matter of conversation in the way it allows others to speak – what is talked about and whom one is talking to*" (Strathern, 1984)

Whereas in the postmodern ethnography because synthetic transcendence is merely evoked and not immanent in the text the subject remains opaque or holistic or pastiche-like (Jameson, 1983 cited by Rabinow 1986), through heterogeneous inter-textuality; performatism enables a plethora of subjectivistic understanding of diplomacy as 'Self-Otherness' to emerge through a 'de-sexualisation' which takes place in the aesthetical reception of the subject by the Reader."*Antitheoretical subjects are opaque (they have no set qualities), but they are always present; the reader always has practical access to them on the basis of a discrete interpretative performance* " (Michael & Knapp). Thus, de-sexualisation takes place in those brief intermittent moments of fictional transcendence when through the affects of Self-Otherness and/or Self-Otherless, diplomacy may appear as a multitude of subject or object:- a child's play; a double headed machine, a madman's delusion, a delirious hymm, a single hard stone, a brilliance, a shadow, a flush, a frown, a chill, whatever form it may manifest into depending on the aesthetic nature of the subject. *This closed, simple whole acquires a potency that can almost only be defined in theological terms. For with it, is created a refuge in which all those things are brought together that postmodernism and poststructuralism thought definitively dissolved: the telos, the author, belief, love, dogma and much, much more*" (Enselman, 2001). It is in this way that diplomacy begins as a legend, appears as a fiction and ends in experience. This is diplomacy performed, wherein post postmodernism is a rejection of victimary sexualized thinking and a turn to "*non-victimary de-sexualized dialogue*" that will "*diminish … the amount of resentment in the world*" (Gans,2001)

Post post-modernism does not deny alienation or estrangement. Rather it fuses alienation and estrangement in order to de-neutralize its conflicting effects and reveal a truth from a simplicity and spontaneity in dealing with duplicity of multiplicity. The point is; between Unity and Multiplicity, there is always choice, a coordinate to adopt. But frequently the spatial self is already a pre-choice. One cannot be forced to love; one must already be in love with the idea of love. Thus post post-modernism requires a sub-conscious and pre-conscious *besire* in the beauty of simplicity, and performatism "*encourages self-therapy because it suggests that we can transcend the force of rampant, oppressive contexts by repeatedly asserting our own selfhood*" (Eshelman, 2001) Post postmodernism is the re-search for the heroic "I":- the invisible, invincible and indivisible "I" of the Self as the One and Only. It is a breaking of the silence of Oneness. It is a returning to love after a long journey through the woods of knowledge; the perils of life. It is both a childlike wisdom and an 'idiotic' humour. A curiosity and a play. It is what some call the era of a new sincerity in submission to the multiplicity of truths which compete for truce in the postmodern imagination as oppose to dishonesty (that ironic futile defiance of alienation) which propagate monstrous truths in an ironic ignoring of ignorance. It is the post-modernist being honest and true to the Self. It is a humbleness in knowledge of the frailties of Self subjectivistic beliefs in a postmodern epoch which threatens Self-love. It is a longing for a beautiful kind of wisdom; one that features love, laughter, idiocy, madness and childishness. It is "*an epoch whose contours are just barely visible and in which we can perceive only simplicity or simple-mindedness. The main thing, though, is to already be in love with it.*"

> "*Theory can be no more than this:*
> *a trap set in the hope that*
> *reality will be naïve enough to fall into it*"
>
> Jean Baudrillard,
> *The Transparency of Evil, 1990*

The postmodern ethnographer is aware of the futility of the method and the limited lifespan it would have, if any, given the rules on acceptable academic discourse and publications of intellect. Thus it never becomes a Thesis in the form presented for PhD dissertation in a British University. No, but its ghostly shadow appears in the corridors of the student unions, in the backroom of reading groups, as posters in Arts Festival, in the drama studios, in experimental workshops, but not as a Thesis. No, there is no postmodern thesis and no fully completed postmodern ethnography (Tyler, 1986). Rather post modernism is a meta-thesis on its own, a "work in progress"; one without permanent structure but which frequently permeate discourse of conflicting or contradictory paradigms in a *rhizomatic* way (Deleuze, 1988). It offers no structure for frameworks to cling on and thus cannot act as a unifying feature for a Meta-Theory to which it is may be subjected to. Post modernism is the humbling state of being in a perplexity over a myriad of possibilities

and contradictions and the postmodern *auto-ethnography* is a return to infancy, to slow contemplative meditation, to speculation and suspicions, to innocence. Diplomatism celebrates the multiplicity of truth by adopting a simplified viewpoint; through embracing the Otherless and the Other in the spirit of the Self, emphasizing the dynamics of ignorance as route to new knowledge and maintaining a truce of truths in representations of reality. Humility in ignorance of truths; and sincerity in the pursuit of knowledge, as opposed to arrogance in superiority of knowledge and dishonesty in objectifying and multiplying universal truths. That is the credo.

Hence, we are stupid only in so far that we are the "New idiots" who believe that *[Philosophers] must no longer accept concepts as gifts, nor merely purify and polish them, but first make and create them, present them and make them convincing"[xvii] (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994). We* are unlearned only in so far that "*we have come to feel that there are no forests where the trees are too far apart, just as patches make quilts only if the spaces between them are small enough"[xviii]* (Tyler, 1986). And we are pretentious only in so far that we submit to a diplomatism of 'truce' in the multiplicity of truths as revealed by 'psychical writing' (Derrida, 1967), 'schizoanalysis' *(Deleuze & Guattari,1998)* or the autistic genius (Eshelman, 2001)

> "The next real literary "rebels" in this country might well emerge as some weird bunch of anti-rebels, born oglers who dare somehow to back away from ironic watching, who have the childish gall actually to endorse and instantiate single-entendre principles… Who eschew self-consciousness and hip fatigue. These anti-rebels would be outdated, of course, before they even started. Dead on the page. Too sincere. Clearly repressed. Backward, quaint, naive, anachronistic.
>
> Maybe that'll be the point. Maybe that's why they'll be the next real rebels. Real rebels, as far as I can see, risk disapproval. The old postmodern insurgents risked the gasp and squeal: shock, disgust, outrage, censorship, accusations of socialism, anarchism, nihilism. Today's risks are different. The new rebels might be artists willing to risk the yawn, the rolled eyes, the cool smile, the nudged ribs, the parody of gifted ironists, the "Oh how banal." To risk accusations of sentimentality, melodrama. Of overcredulity. Of softness. Of willingness to be suckered by a world of lurkers and starers who fear gaze and ridicule above imprisonment without law. Who knows. " [23]
>
> Wallace, David Foster (1993)
> "E Unibus Pluram: Television and U.S. Fiction,"

…

References:

1) Alexander, Bryant Keith (2005) "*Performance Ethnography : The re-enacting & Inciting of Culture*; The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, eds Denzin & Lincoln, 2005)

2) Baudrillard,Jean (1990) "The Transparency of evil", Verso, London

3) Clifford, James & Marcus, George E (1986) "Writing Culture: The Poetics & Politics of Ethnography" London, England, University of California Press,Ltd.

4) Coffey, A. (1999). *The ethnographic self: Fieldwork and the representation of identity.* London: Sage Ltd.

5) Constantinou, Costa (1996) University of Minnesota Prss, Minneapolis

6) Der Derian (1987)"On Diplomacy", Basil Blackwell Ltd, UK

7) Derrida, Jacques (1982)"Sending : On representation," Social Research 49 (summer 1982): 295)

8) Derrida, Jacques (1990) *Force de loi: Le "fondement mystique de l'autorité"*, (1990) (republished: Paris 1994) Cardozo law review 919-1045

9) Derrida, Jacques (1967) Writing and Difference, Routledge Classics

10)Derrida, Jacques (1974) Of Grammatology, translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London

11)Deleuze, Gilles & Guattari,Felix (1988) A Thousand Plateaus:Capitalism and Schizophrenia, Continuum, London

12)Deleuze, Gilles & Guattari,Felix (1994) What is Philosophy ? Verso,London

13) Deleuze, Gilles & Guattari,Felix (1994) (1984) Anti-Oedipus:Capitalism and Schizophrenia, Continuum, London

14) Diggins (1994) *The promise of pragmatism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

15) Ellis, C. and Bochner, A.P. (2000) Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd edn., pp.733-768). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

16)Foucalt, Michel (2008) "The Government of Self and Others" eds Frederic Gros,Trasnlated by Graham Burchell, Palgrave and Macmillan

17)Denzin, N.K. (1978). "The Research act". New York. McGraw-Hill

18)Denzin,Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (2005), The Sage Handbook of Qualitative (3rdEdition) Research, SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, London

19)Eshelman, Raoul (2001), Performatism, or the End of Postmodernism, Anthropoetics 6, no. 2 (Fall 2000 / Winter 2001)

20)Fuller (2002); Philosophy, rhetoric and the end of knowledge- A new beginning for science and technology studies, Lawrence Erlbaum Assocs. Inc, USA

21)Gans, Eric (2001) Moral Heroism Chronicles of Love and Resentment No. 237: Saturday, June 9, 2001

22)*Gehring Petra* Force and "Mystical Foundation" of Law: How JacquesDerrida Addresses Legal Discourse articles : special issue a dedication to jacques derrida - justice

23)Greenwood,DJ. And Levin, M (2008) *Reform of the Social Sciences and of Universities through Action Research, eds* Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. eds, The Landscape of Qualitative Research /, Sage Publications, USA 2008

24) … (1998b) *Introduction to action research: Social research for social change*. Thousand Oaks,CA:Sage Heikkenen et al., 2001, quoted by Greenwood & Levin, 1998b)

25) Diggins (1994) *The promise of pragmatism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

26) Eikeland, Olav (2008): The Ways of Aristotle.Aristotelian phrónêsis, Aristotelian Philosophy of Dialogue, and Action Research

27) Fielding, Jane and and Fielding, Nigel,(2008) *Synergy and Synthesis: Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Data* in eds. Alasuutari,Pertti, Bickman,Leanord and Brannen, Julia The SAGE Handbook of Social Research Methods, 2008,SAGE Publications ltd, London

28) Heideger, Martin (1972) On time and Being

29) Hoffman, J (2003) *Reconstructing diplomacy* British Journal of Politics and International Relations, Vol. 5, No. 4, November 2003, pp. 525–542

30) Janoski, T (1991) *Synthetic strategies in comparative sociological research:Methods and Problems of Internal and External analysis* (59-81) in Issues and alternatives in comparative social research ed Charles Ragin,New York, 1991

31) Jonnson & Hall (2005) *Essence of Diplomacy*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York

32) Jones, Stacey Holamn (2005) Auto-Ethnography : Making the Personal Political in Denzin,Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (2005)The Sage Handbook of Qualitative (3rdEdition) Research, SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, London

33) Micjael and Knapp"Against Theory" (Mitchell 1985, orig. 1982) cited by Schelman, 2001

34) Little,Margaret (2007a) "Virtue as Knowledge:Objections from the Philosophy of Mind" in Foundations of Ethics eds Russ Shafer Landau and Terence Cuneo (2007) Blackwell Publications

35) Little,Margaret (2007b) "Seeing and Caring : The Role of Affect in Feminist Moral Epistemology" in Foundations of Ethics eds Russ Shafer Landau and Terence Cuneo (2007) Blackwell Publications

36) Mcdowell, John (1979) "Virtue and Reason" The Monist.

37) Murray, S (2008) *Consolidating the Gains Made in Diplomacy Studies: A Taxonomy* International Studies Perspectives (2008) 9, 22–39

38) Nussbaum,Martha(1986) "The Discernment of Perception " an Aristotleian Conception of Private and Public Rationality" Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquim in Ancient Philosophy, vol 1, ed. John Cleary University Press of America, chapter 6.

39) Padgaonkar, Nikhil (2008) An interview on Love with Jacques Derrida, (2008)http:/www.csun.edu.coms.gra

40) Rabinow , Paul (1986) "Representations are Social Facts" in Clifford, James & Marcus, George E (1986) "Writing Culture: The Poetics & Politics of Ethnography" London, England, University of California Press,Ltd.

41) Richardson, Laurel & St. Pierre, Elizabeth Adams; "Writing: A Method of Inquiry"in The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, eds Denzin & Lincoln, 2005)

42) Sharp, P (1999) *For Diplomacy: Representation and the Study of International Relations*, International Studies Association, Published by Blackwell Publishers, USA, and Oxford, UK.

43) … (2008) *Diplomacy, Diplomats, and Diplomatic Studies*, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the ISA's 49th Annual Convention, Bridging Multiple Divides, Hilton San Francisco, CA, USA, Mar 26, 2008

44) Smith, S (2002) *Alternative and Critical Perspectives*, in "Millenial Reflections on International Studies" eds Michael Brecher & Frank P. Harvey (2002), Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press

45) Staham, A, Richardson,L & Cook, J.A. (1991) "Gender & University Teaching". Albany: State University of New York Press.

46) Strathern,Marilyn (1984) "Dislodging a World View: Challenge and Counter-Challenge in the Relationship Between Feminism and Anthropology"

47) Svedberg,Erika (2002) *Feminist Theory and International Negotiations International Studies Perspectives* ~2002! 3, 139–175.A a re-worked chapter of a doctoral dissertation, defended at the Department of Political Science at Lund University, Sweden

48) Tyler, Stephen (1986) Post-modern Ethnography in Clifford, James & Marcus, George E (1986) "Writing Culture: The Poetics & Politics of Ethnography" London, England, University of California Press,Ltd.

49) Wallace, David Foster. "E Unibus Pluram: Television and U.S. Fiction". *Review of Contemporary Fiction* 13 (2): 151–194.

50) Wight,M (1966), *Why is there no theory of International Relations ?,* eds Butterfield and Wight (1966) Diplomatic Investigations : Essays in the Theory of International Politics, Unwin University Books

51) Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy with Ambassador of Malaysia (x), 27 November 2009

52) Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy with Ambassador of Malaysia(y), October 2009

53) Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy with Ambassador of Palestine, 2009

54) Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy with Ambassador of Mexico, 2010

55) Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy with Deputy High Commissioner of UK, 2010

56) Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy with Deputy High Commissioner of Netherlands, 2010

57) Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy with High Commissioner of Pakistan, 2010

58) Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy with Ambassador of Greece, 2009

59) Interview on Diplomacy as Practical Philosophy with Ambassador of Ethiopia, 2009

…

[i] Jacques Derrida, *Force de loi: Le "fondement mystique de l'autorité"*, 11 CARDOZO LAW REVIEW 919-1045 (1990) (republished: Paris 1994) cited by *By Petra Gehring in* "Force and "Mystical Foundation" of Law: How Jacques Derrida Addresses Legal Discourse Derrida in her book INNEN DES AUßEN - AUßEN DES INNEN. FOUCAULT, DERRIDA, LYOTARD (1994).

[ii] [Rogues] 34-35 (2003) [not yet translated into English] cited by Petra Gehring.

[iii] Cited by Constantinou (2006)

[iv] Cited by Derrida(1964)p.5

[v] Cited by Gehring (1994)

[vi] See Constantinou for discussion

[vii] In the context of Feminism in Anthropology

[viii] (E.B. Tyler, The Origins of Culture)

[ix] Deleuze & Guattari (1994) pg. 79

[x] Ibid, pg 79

[xi] Raymond Aron, Peace and war cited by Der Derian p. 8)

[xii] cited by Der derian (1987)

[xiii] Jacques Derrida, "Sending: On representation," Social Research 49 (summer 1982): 295)

[xiv] Tyler, pg. 133

[xv] See Micjael and Knapp"Against Theory" (Mitchell 1985, orig. 1982) cited by Schelman, 2001

[xvi] Liddell, H.G.; Scott, R.. "Adamas". *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Perseus Project. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-

[xvii] pg. 5.

[xviii] p. 132