A Diplomatic Approach to Global Cooperation on Covid-19 Lockdown

Nurdina Tamelia[1], Sunny Ummul Firdaus[2], and Najib Satria[2(✉)]

[1] Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia
nurdinatameliaa@student.uns.ac.id
[2] Faculty of Law, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia
satnajib714@gmail.com

Abstract. In 2020 the world is facing a global COVID-19 pandemic and the biggest health crisis since World War 2. To overcome the spread of the epidemic, almost the whole world has implemented a "lockdown" policy or the closure of countries or cities from migration, including restrictions on the entry of goods and services. The health crisis resulted in the cessation of social, cultural, religious, educational, business activities, etc., which significantly affected the national economy. To achieve the common goal of overcoming COVID-19, international cooperation is urgently needed. No single country has anticipated the emergence of the COVID-19 outbreak, so international cooperation is needed that begins with the implementation of effective diplomacy. Not only government actors are involved but also non-government actors including the mass media. This article analyses multi-track diplomacy to deal with "the great lockdown", by applying the concept of multi-track diplomacy to support government policies. The presence of non-government actors who are more flexible than government actors is expected to overcome coordination and communication problems that often hinder the effectiveness of cooperation. The author uses the type of normative research. The research approach with a conceptual approach and a case approach is used by the authors to examine the issue of the COVID-19 case which was solved by implementing global cooperation by diplomatic approach. Data that the author can source from the results of other research, documents, and others to solve the issues or problems encountered. The data can be in the form of books, relevant research results, related journals and articles, scientific publications related to research, and legal materials from electronic media (internet). Data collection is done by literature study by reviewing and studying the data obtained. Multi-track diplomacy presupposes that the government acts as an initiator and policy designer, involving, mobilizing, and empowering non-governmental actors. With the passage of the multi-channel diplomacy mechanism, all elements and stakeholders can carry out their optimal roles. The need for multi-track diplomacy in implementing international cooperation so that the common goal of overcoming Covid-19 is achieved. The conclusion that can be drawn from the current situation is that the lack of involvement of non-state actors in international cooperation has led to the lack of success in efforts to tackle COVID-19 optimally at a global level. When global cooperation has succeeded in overcoming this pandemic, it is necessary to think about designing new mechanisms to anticipate the recurrence of

similar disasters in the future. The new mechanism can be in the form of strengthening existing international organizations, establishing a new order, including the involvement of non-state actors as part of the global mechanism.

Keywords: Diplomatic · Global Cooperation · Covid-19

1   Introduction

On January 30, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 as a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC). On 11 February 2020, WHO introduced the name of this virus as "coronavirus disease 19 or COVID-19, and it was followed on 11 March 2020 as a pandemic. On March 31, the Chair Delegates from the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Food Organization (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) issued a joint statement calling on country governments to minimize the spread of the COVID-19 outbreak by guarding borders and overseeing trade and imports. Food. In these conditions it is a time to show solidarity, act responsibly and work together towards a common goal of ensuring food security, food safety and nutrition and promoting the general well-being of people around the world [1].

International organizations are often blamed when global problems arise, or are criticized for violating state sovereignty in the name of global interests, or for failing to implement an agenda to achieve stated goals. Blaming is common when assessing relations between international organizations and member states. No country can face this challenge alone, so international cooperation is the obligation of all governments to tackle global issues as they are today. Cooperation, especially with countries in the region, includes coordinating, sharing information and exchanging experiences regarding the implementation of best practices that have been successful in other countries.

"Lockdown" is the best way to inhibit, limit and overcome the spread of COVID-19 both domestically and between countries. This effort is currently being carried out by many countries around the world, so that the world is experiencing "The Great Lockdown". But tackling COVID-19 requires a more serious effort than "lockdown", social distancing or travel bans. Even China, South Korea and Japan have succeeded in containing the spread of the virus, which would mean little without international cooperation [2]. International cooperation is very necessary considering that not all countries enforce policies and have the same social, economic, political system, so that there are variations in the success of "lockdown" from one country to another [3]. Some countries still deny the existence of the virus, some countries respond slowly or not seriously, and some countries do not have sufficient resources to tackle the problem. The peak of the global pandemic is still uncertain, including when it will end. To overcome this crisis, the international community in addition to requiring international cooperation and effective leadership. An example of effective leadership is when the United States (US) implements a global war against terrorism (GWT) policy that has proven to be effective. Currently, in handling COVID-19, there does not appear to be any effective leadership from either the leaders of large countries such as the US or the Chair of International Institutions such as the WHO [4].

2   Research Method

The author uses the type of normative research. The research approach with a conceptual approach and a case approach is used by the authors to examine the issue of the COVID-19 case which was solved by implementing international cooperation. Data that the author can source from the results of other research, documents, and others to solve the issues or problems encountered. The data can be in the form of books, relevant research results, related journals and articles, scientific publications related to research, and legal materials from electronic media (internet). Data collection is done by literature study by reviewing and studying the data obtained.

3   Discussion

3.1   Disaster Diplomacy Related to COVID-19 Handling

In general, diplomacy can play a role in: 1). Maintaining relationships between individuals (people to people contact). 2) Strengthen processes that build harmony. 3) Provide a forum for designing and implementing international policies. 4). International business and trade cooperation. And 5) Health and disaster management [5]. Diplomacy can have a lasting effect into a treaty. Every sovereign state has the ability to make treaties. Diplomacy is a form of informal approach towards an informal step in the international treaty process. The international community regulates it in Article 6 of the 1969 Vienna Convention [6].

Diplomacy's role in handling COVID-19 is the implementation of the fifth function, namely health and disaster management. In this context, the term "Disaster Diplomacy" is known, which involves various actors, both government and non-government in dealing with problems.

The term "disaster diplomacy" ("disaster diplomacy") is related to disaster activities, including prevention, mitigation, response and healing, which involve cooperation between previously hostile parties, both on a national and international scale. Disaster diplomacy began to be recognized when cities Hualien in Taiwan in 2018 experienced an earthquake and invited the involvement and assistance of the international community. Likewise, when the Maldives was declared a state of emergency. In 2018, which also involved international cooperation. In this case of COVID-19, the world is facing various humanitarian problems including humanitarian catastrophe, global recession, destruction of the health system, destruction of social order, and nationalism. No single country can handle these problems alone [7].

In general, diplomacy is an official relationship between two or more countries for purposes as diverse as economic, socio-cultural, political and security. Conventional diplomacy or the first pathway, is only carried out by official representatives of the government, while multichannel diplomacy is the involvement of various actors, government and non-government, in various forms, or pathways, involving participation and stakeholders in various formats [5]. The first line of diplomacy involves only the government, interacting and communicating only with official government institutions. The rapid process of globalization has led to very basic changes in the goals and practice

of diplomacy, so that it requires the involvement of various actors, so that the concept of multi-track diplomacy emerges. Multi-track diplomacy can involve Heads of State, Policymakers and Government, by involving other actors such as business people, professional groups, academics, humanitarian activists, including the mass media as the most important actor communicating the results of agreements and activities carried out. Multi-track diplomacy is a conceptual way of looking at the international diplomacy process with different goals from a pragmatic system. The involvement of a network of interrelated activities, if used effectively, makes a valuable contribution to problem solving, through the diverse resources of individuals, institutions, and community groups that work together to achieve goals in different countries [3].

Urgent Action Needed.
Diplomacy Multi-track diplomacy can serve a variety of purposes. For example, helping to establish cooperation and participation of grassroots groups and civil society where these groups are not normally involved. Diplomacy also aims to maintain communication lines when actors representing the government, including diplomats, do not communicate effectively. This activity can also be used as a forum to discuss government actions and policies that are bringing about results. As a result, attention to health and problems in various countries has become increasingly important in the rapidly changing global diplomacy agenda. The high demands on diplomacy to deal with global health require complex collaboration in addition to the involvement of medical experts, society, legal knowledge, in addition to diplomatic skills that have not been systematically developed by either the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or global professional groups in the health sector [8]. On the other hand, high expectations regarding health diplomacy in a health crisis such as COVID-19, require that health initiatives at the global level have certainly increased and diplomatic goals are beyond the conventional diplomatic function.

Role and International Cooperation through the G-20 Group and WHO.
International cooperation will not be effective without leadership. Who is expected to lead the handling of this COVID-19? Multi-track diplomacy requires the government's role as the initiator of various programs and action plans. These leaders are expected to mobilize other actors, including professional organizations, non-governmental organizations, trade unions, employers, and academics. No less important is managing information and communication lines that can be used to convey and manage information related to COVID-19.

Now is the right time to rethink and reorganize the function of diplomacy under the concept of multi-track diplomacy. It is necessary to think about the formation of long-term international cooperation involving the cooperation of various stakeholders in the health sector, both professional organizations and intergovernmental organizations in dealing with global pandemics such as.

The G20 Group, is an organization that is expected to play a major role in assisting the handling of COVID-19, especially in the aspect of global economic cooperation. At a special meeting to discuss COVID-19, which was conducted virtually, it was agreed to donate USD 5 trillion in economic stimulation assistance. However, the G20 group, which is the main forum for economic cooperation between global economic powers, has generally not played its role or "missing in action" in the case of COVID-19 [9].

With the members of the G-20 being the countries with the largest and strongest economies in the world, the G-20 countries should be able to play more of a role in responding to health and economic crises. In contrast to when the world faced the global financial crisis (GFC) in 2008–2009, at that time the G-20 group had changed the nature of meetings between Finance Ministers to become the main forum for crisis management. By responding relatively quickly through the implementation of effective policies to deal with the crisis. The special strength is its informal nature which allows the involvement of a network of technocrats, government officials and bureaucrats to overcome the rigid bureaucratic chains of international organizations to deal with the global depression. Since then, the G-20 group has changed from a crisis committee to a steering committee, facilitating international cooperation on a wide range of issues, from health to developing women's participation in economic activities. Therefore, the current crisis leads to demands to play a role once again. When they finally met on March 26, the leaders of the G20 nations pledged to do whatever it took to tackle this pandemic, even though the joint statement issued did not show any real commitment. In addition, the responses given were limited and unclear. Broadly the same as that put forward by the Health Working Group on March 7, 2020, which concluded a one-page statement without any real commitment or plan of action. There is a suggestion that the G-20 hold a high-level meeting of G20 heads of state for a formal meeting.

At the meeting on March 26, 2020, the G-20 leaders pledged to do everything possible to contain the pandemic, but the joint statement issued lacked concrete commitments. One of the statements contained a pledge to disburse USD 5 trillion for global economic recovery. But there were no statements about banning exports of medical devices, funding vaccines, or dealing with economic crises for developing countries.

Meanwhile, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) meeting attended by the Ministers of Finance brought more concrete results such as delaying debt repayments for low-income countries. So far there have been no new actions related to the health crisis and no response to the IMF's demands to support its resources. The source of the failure to address the COVID-19 issue stems from the nature of the G20 organization and includes the wider international context in which it operates.

The first obstacle is the organization's focus on global financial issues. The G-20 group consists of the Minister of Finance, the Governor of the Central Bank and officials engaged in finance. Not all issues are discussed at the G-20. The nature of this organization is the key to success when responding to the global financial crisis, while not producing real action in the Covid-9 pandemic crisis. There are no related discussions, for example debt delays. Focusing on finances means ignoring issues such as health, which seem to be beyond the authority of financial policy makers.

The expansion of the G-20 membership causes additional members to feel uncomfortable due to the focus on financial issues as seen during the COVID-19 pandemic crisis [7]. This does not mean that the G20 is less participatory than the wider stakeholder. Indeed, the last decade has seen the institutionalization of the groups involved, by integrating actors from civil society into the G-20, including non-governmental organizations/NGOs, trade unions, women, academics, and business associations. It is hoped that their involvement can bring a wider perspective to the agenda discussed.

These groups have lobbied influential countries for a holistic review of the COVID-19 health crisis, including seriously discussing the health dimension and further such as debt management issues [10]. Their efforts so far have been fruitless. The process of involving non-state actors in an effort to participate in dealing with the COVID-19 problem faces serious challenges, especially when officials in the G-20 treat inputs and proposals as opportunities to barter policy priorities. These proposals are often not seen as an effort to assist the handling to achieve common goals. As compensation, civil society publishes a joint statement outside the forum, although with little effect. The biggest problem is the fact that this crisis situation demands actions and initiatives that only the country's leaders can undertake. The presence of heads of state alone is not enough, especially in some countries there are "populist" leaders, who reject the establishment of global governance and international cooperation. In addition, the ongoing crisis in several countries is caused by differences in country characteristics, economic income, social mobility, and increasing unemployment and people living below the poverty line. These matters are still not a topic of discussion and resolution. G20 member states do not have the freedom to escape this responsibility, which they have been trying since 2010 to come up with a meaningful solution.

As a result, confidence in the effectiveness of international cooperation has dropped dramatically, with the G-20 member countries widely divided on North-South differences. In this context, it is not surprising that the response of the leaders of the G-20 is to highlight differences, apart from being involved in implementing policies to help poor countries. In short, the failure of the G-20 member countries to demonstrate the strength of global cooperation stems from their nature as organizations. There is little hope for a fundamental change in the problems at hand, either through an effective response to the health crisis or the emergence of a new agenda for dealing with the economic crisis. Even before the implementation of "Lockdown".

4   Conclusion

The current condition when international cooperation is minimal and ineffective can be described as countries that are "fighting in their respective battlefields". In addition, each country without coordination, only based on the reality faced by each country. Even though the handling of Covid-19 requires extensive cooperation, coordination, and coupled with effective leadership. In fact, we already have a set of institutions and global and global initiatives, but it is not enough to play a role when several big countries are not facing the same problem.

Looking at the performance of the International Organizations who are competent in dealing with health issues (WHO) and Global finance (G20), the two organizations still have not carried out effective collaboration to deal with this global pandemic problem. The problem faced is the ineffective collaboration between international organizations and other stakeholders related to these two fields. Non-governmental organizations are still not widely involved in the formulation of policies for concrete actions. No less important is the absence of international organizations and state governments in managing global media. The mass media can play a major role in publishing the latest information about the actual pandemic conditions, so that the general public can be

more informed about the actual situation faced by each country. The media can also be used to publish best practices in handling pandemics by countries that have already succeeded in overcoming the COVID-19 outbreak.

References

1. World Health Organization. Infectious Diseases, (2020) https://www.who.int. A
2. Djelantik, S. Kerjasama Global Menangani the "Great Lockdown"; Pendekatan Diplomasi Multijalur. Jurnal Ilmiah Hubungan Internasional, 113–120 (2020).
3. Purbantina, A. P., Hapsari, R. D.: Diplomasi Kesehatan di Era Pandemik Global: Analisa Bantuan Penanganan Covid-19 dari Negara Jepang dan Korea Selatan ke Indonesia. Global and Policy Journal of International Relations 8(01), (2020).
4. Putri, R. N.: Perbandingan sistem kesehatan di negara Berkembang DAN negara maju. Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Batanghari Jambi 19(1), 139-146 (2019).
5. Djelantik, S.: Diplomasi Dalam Teori dan Praktek. Graha Ilmu, Yogyakarta (2018).
6. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969 (Vienna Convention 1969
7. Disaster Diplomacy, http:www.disasterdiplomacy.org
8. RT magazine, 36 More Countries Documented First Coronavirus Cases, https://www.rtmagazine.com/disorders-diseases/infectious-diseases/other-infections/36- more-countries-documented-first-coronavirus- cases
9. Astuti, W. R. D.: Kerja Sama G20 dalam Pemulihan Ekonomi Global dari COVID-19. Andalas Journal of International Studies (AJIS) 9(2), 131-148 (2020).
10. Dural. Health Insurance Changes Highly Irresponsible, Herald letter with Media Watch (2008), http://www.heraldletters.com.au/?=97, last accessed 2022/7/2.