

Mental Health as a Cornerstone of Global Foreign Policy: A Case Study in Psycho-Diplomacy

Dr Jaimine Vaishnav¹ & Dr Simarjeet Makkar²

¹TEDxGateway speaker and a Faculty of Geopolitics and World Trade at Atlas SkillTech University, Mumbai

²Associate Professor, heading the Department of Liberal Arts at Atlas SkillTech University, Mumbai

Received: 11.11.2025 | Accepted: 01.12.2025 | Published: 04.12.2025

*Corresponding Author: Dr Jaimine Vaishnav

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.17816564](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17816564)

Abstract

Original Research Article

This research examines the critical gap in contemporary foreign policy frameworks regarding mental health considerations and proposes an integrated approach called "Psycho-Diplomacy."

Through analysis of global mental health data, case studies of major international crises, and examination of current diplomatic practices, this study demonstrates that psychological well-being represents a fundamental but overlooked factor in international stability. The research argues that traditional foreign policy models, which prioritize economic and military concerns while marginalizing mental health, are inadequate for addressing modern global challenges.

The study presents evidence linking mental health infrastructure to political stability, economic productivity, and social cohesion, and proposes a framework for incorporating psychological science into diplomatic practice.

Keywords: Psycho-diplomacy, mental health gap, global stability, policy reform, psychological science, diplomacy integration.

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Introduction

International diplomatic forums consistently prioritize conventional security concerns, economic arrangements, and military capabilities. However, these discussions largely overlook a fundamental crisis affecting global populations: widespread mental health challenges. Current estimates indicate that approximately one billion individuals worldwide experience mental health conditions, yet policy frameworks treat psychological well-being as secondary to other diplomatic priorities (World Health Organization, 2022).

This approach represents a significant oversight in international relations theory and practice. The human and economic costs of mental health challenges exceed those of many issues that dominate foreign policy agendas, yet receive

disproportionately limited attention in diplomatic contexts. This research examines why mental health must be repositioned as central to foreign policy considerations and proposes practical frameworks for implementing this shift.

The Scale of the Global Mental Health Challenge

Epidemiological Evidence

Current data reveals the scope of global mental health challenges. Depression affects over 280 million people worldwide, while anxiety disorders impact 301 million individuals (World Health Organization, 2021). Annual suicide deaths exceed 700,000 globally, surpassing combined fatalities from armed



conflicts, natural disasters, and terrorist incidents (World Health Organization, 2021).

These figures indicate a crisis of significant magnitude, yet they receive minimal consideration in foreign policy planning. The disconnect between the scale of mental health challenges and their representation in international relations frameworks suggests a fundamental misalignment between diplomatic priorities and population needs.

Economic Implications

Mental health conditions generate substantial economic costs. Global productivity losses attributable to mental health challenges exceed one trillion US dollars annually, surpassing the gross domestic product of several major economies (Chisholm et al., 2016). These economic impacts exceed the military expenditures of most nations, yet receive a fraction of comparable policy attention.

Research demonstrates that countries with developed mental health infrastructure experience measurably better economic outcomes. The relationship between psychological support systems and economic performance suggests that mental health investment represents not merely humanitarian concern but strategic economic policy (Bloom et al., 2011).

Political Stability Correlations

Evidence indicates meaningful correlations between mental health infrastructure and political stability. Countries with comprehensive mental health systems demonstrate higher scores on peace indices and greater resilience to external disruptions (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2023). This relationship suggests causation rather than mere correlation, indicating that psychological well-being contributes substantively to stable governance and social cohesion.

Analysis of recent political upheavals reveals patterns of societal disconnection, collective anxiety, and unaddressed trauma underlying major political transitions. While these events involve multiple causal factors, the

psychological dimensions warrant greater consideration in foreign policy analysis (Cottam et al., 2015).

Case Study Analysis: Foreign Policy Failures Related to Mental Health Neglect

Military Personnel Mental Health

Military alliances such as NATO focus extensively on defense spending benchmarks while member nations experience elevated suicide rates among service members. The United States, with annual defense expenditures exceeding 700 billion dollars, loses more military personnel to suicide than combat operations (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 2022).

This pattern illustrates a fundamental contradiction: substantial investment in military capability without corresponding attention to the psychological well-being of military personnel. The result is a force structure that appears strong in conventional metrics but experiences internal vulnerability due to unaddressed mental health challenges.

The Displacement Crisis

Over 100 million people are currently forcibly displaced worldwide, creating unprecedented psychological challenges (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2023). International responses emphasize logistical concerns such as camp administration, border management, and resettlement procedures while systematically overlooking mental health dimensions of displacement.

Research consistently demonstrates that psychological trauma from displacement often exceeds the original circumstances driving flight. Family separation, cultural dislocation, legal uncertainty, and social stigma create compounding mental health challenges that conventional humanitarian responses inadequately address (Fazel et al., 2012). The result is populations trapped in cycles of psychological distress that impede successful integration and perpetuate social tensions.

Germany's experience during the 2015 displacement crisis demonstrates both



challenges and opportunities. Initial responses prioritized housing and basic services while mental health needs remained largely unaddressed. This approach contributed to integration difficulties, social tensions, and political reactions (Böcker & Kohls, 2017). Where mental health support was implemented, integration outcomes improved substantially, yet this lesson has not been systematically incorporated into broader foreign policy approaches.

The Syrian conflict generated over 13 million displaced and internally displaced persons, creating trauma affecting an entire generation (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2023). International conferences addressing Syria emphasize ceasefire agreements and reconstruction funding while minimizing attention to the reality that widespread psychological trauma will influence regional stability for decades. Without addressing this mental health dimension, peace agreements remain structurally incomplete.

Climate Change and Psychological Impact

Climate change discussions in foreign policy contexts focus primarily on emissions reduction, technology transfer, and adaptation infrastructure while overlooking psychological dimensions of environmental change. Research has identified "eco-anxiety" as an emerging phenomenon, particularly among younger demographics experiencing distress about environmental degradation (Clayton, 2020).

Small island nations confronting sea-level rise experience what researchers term "solastalgia"—distress caused by environmental change in home environments (Albrecht et al., 2007). When entire communities face potential extinction due to climate change, the psychological impact extends beyond physical displacement. These populations confront existential concerns that conventional climate adaptation strategies do not address.

Climate-induced migration will generate mental health challenges at unprecedented scale. Projections suggest climate change could displace over 200 million people by 2050

(Rigaud et al., 2018), yet international climate agreements minimally acknowledge the psychological support these populations will require. Diplomatic discussions focus on carbon markets and renewable energy targets while overlooking the mental health infrastructure necessary to support climate adaptation.

Economic Development Programs

International development assistance, despite evolution over decades, continues treating mental health as peripheral to economic growth. This approach fundamentally misunderstands the relationship between psychological well-being and productivity. Countries with developed mental health systems consistently demonstrate superior performance in economic development, innovation, and social mobility metrics (Lund et al., 2018).

Development programs often overlook psychological barriers preventing sustainable outcomes. Agricultural training for farmers experiencing depression yields limited results. Entrepreneurship education for women suffering domestic violence-related trauma produces unsustainable outcomes. Mental health is not separate from development—it is foundational to it (Patel et al., 2018).

Microfinance programs exemplify this oversight. While providing capital access, many programs do not address the psychological stress associated with debt and entrepreneurial responsibility. Research reveals that microfinance can increase depression and anxiety rates among borrowers, particularly women, yet this finding has not substantially altered development approaches (Fernald et al., 2008).

Digital Technology and Global Mental Health

Digital platforms operating across borders with minimal regulation contribute to rising rates of anxiety, depression, and social isolation globally. Research from multiple countries demonstrates consistent patterns: increased social media use correlates with higher rates of depression, anxiety, and suicidal



ideation, particularly among adolescents (Twenge et al., 2018).

International discussions about digital governance emphasize data privacy, market competition, and security threats while minimizing attention to psychological impacts of interconnected digital environments. The phenomenon of compulsive negative news consumption has generated what researchers term "headline stress disorder" across populations worldwide (Newman et al., 2020). Constant exposure to global crises, amplified by algorithmic systems designed to maximize engagement, generates chronic anxiety that traditional mental health systems struggle to address.

Misinformation-campaigns...exploit psychological vulnerabilities on a global scale, yet foreign policy responses focus on technical solutions rather than addressing mental health factors that make populations susceptible to manipulation. Addressing psychological vulnerabilities might prove more effective than technical countermeasures alone (Lewandowsky et al., 2017).

A Framework for Psycho-Diplomacy

Conceptual Foundation

If international cooperation were to genuinely prioritize mental health, it would require not merely new policies but an entirely new diplomatic paradigm grounded in psychological science. This emerging approach, termed "Psycho-Diplomacy," reframes global relations through the lens of human behavior, trauma, emotional regulation, and collective resilience.

Psycho-Diplomacy can be defined as diplomacy informed by psychological science. It recognizes that negotiations are not merely geopolitical exchanges but deeply human interactions shaped by cognition, emotion, identity, trauma, and perception. Traditional diplomacy assumes rational state actors. Psycho-Diplomacy acknowledges that actual humans—with anxieties, cognitive biases, motivations, and psychological wounds—shape decisions impacting millions (Goldstein & Keohane, 1993).

Core Components of Psycho-Diplomatic Training

To operationalize this framework, diplomatic personnel must receive training in several key areas:

Trauma-Informed-Negotiation:

Understanding the psychological consequences of war, displacement, and historical oppression enables diplomats to approach conflicts with both empathy and strategic sensitivity. Regions including the Balkans, Rwanda, and Palestine-Israel demonstrate that unaddressed collective trauma perpetuates cycles of tension across decades (Volkan, 2001).

Cognitive Biases: Diplomats must recognize how confirmation bias, loss aversion, and heuristic shortcuts affect negotiation outcomes. International crises—from vaccine inequity to trade breakdowns—often escalate not primarily due to conflicting interests but due to misperceptions (Kahneman, 2011).

Group Identity Theory: Understanding in-group and out-group dynamics can prevent escalation of ethnic, nationalistic, or ideological conflicts. Brexit, global populism, and sectarian divisions underscore how identity politics now drives geopolitical behavior (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Behavioral Economics: Policies built on psychological/insight—encouraging cooperation, reducing mistrust, incentivizing compliance—tend to produce more sustainable agreements than coercion-based approaches (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008).

Emotional Intelligence: Negotiators with developed emotional intelligence de-escalate tensions, build trust more effectively, and craft solutions addressing emotional needs alongside political ones. Emotional intelligence has been a significant factor in historic breakthroughs including the Good Friday Agreement and Colombian peace negotiations (Goleman, 1995).

Intercultural Sensitivity: Misreading cultural cues or emotional norms has undermined countless diplomatic efforts. Psycho-Diplomacy incorporates deep cultural attunement into global negotiation training (Cohen, 1997).



Practical Applications in International Negotiations

If psychological literacy became mandatory for diplomatic personnel, the structure of global politics would shift substantially:

Fewer conflicts would devolve into stalemates because negotiators would recognize emotional triggers and identity threats before escalation. Peace agreements would incorporate trauma healing mechanisms, reducing relapse into violence. Climate negotiations would address eco-anxiety, community grief, and psychological barriers to behavior change, leading to stronger public support (Swim et al., 2011).

Trade agreements would factor in mental health impacts of displacement, debt stress, and industrial transitions. Refugee frameworks would include large-scale psychological rehabilitation, not merely logistics and border management. Cyber and artificial intelligence governance would shift from purely technical regulation to protecting global psychological safety. Public diplomacy strategies would move from information campaigns to psychologically informed engagement building trust rather than polarization (Cull, 2019).

In essence, Psycho-Diplomacy reframes foreign policy not as a strategic chessboard but as a human ecosystem where emotional realities determine geopolitical outcomes as significantly as material power.

Policy Recommendations

Institutional Reforms

International organizations require structural changes to address mental health systematically. The United Nations, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and regional bodies should establish chief mental health officer positions with substantive policy influence. Foreign assistance programs should include mandatory mental health components, and trade agreements should assess psychological impacts on affected populations (Patel et al., 2018).

International standards for mental health care equivalent to human rights or environmental protection frameworks are needed. Countries should face accountability for providing basic mental health services, with international support available for capacity building. The World Health Organization's mental health action plan provides a foundation, but implementation requires elevated priority and resources (World Health Organization, 2013).

Integration into Existing Frameworks

Mental health considerations must be integrated into every major international agreement. Climate accords should address psychological adaptation alongside physical infrastructure. Trade agreements should consider mental health impacts on displaced workers. Peace agreements should include provisions for trauma recovery and psychological rehabilitation. Arms control treaties should acknowledge mental health costs of militarization (Silove et al., 2017).

Diplomatic Training Reform

Mental health diplomacy must become as important as economic or security diplomacy. This requires training diplomatic personnel to understand psychological factors in negotiation and conflict resolution. It means embedding mental health professionals in foreign policy teams and international organizations. It means measuring diplomatic success not solely by agreements signed but by improvements in population well-being (Fisher & Shapiro, 2005).

Discussion

The evidence presented demonstrates that continuing to marginalize mental health in foreign policy represents an unsustainable approach. Social media-driven polarization, climate anxiety, displacement trauma, and economic insecurity create psychological conditions that undermine the stability traditional foreign policy tools attempt to preserve. Current approaches treat symptoms while underlying conditions remain unaddressed.



The question is not whether integrating mental health into foreign policy is idealistic but whether continuing to ignore it is sustainable. The answer becomes increasingly clear as traditional diplomatic approaches prove inadequate for contemporary challenges (Cottam et al., 2015).

The choice is stark: evolve international relations frameworks to encompass human psychological realities or observe foundations of global stability deteriorate under the weight of collective mental health challenges. The scale of these challenges demands fundamental rethinking of how nations interact, compete, and cooperate. Mental health must move from periphery to center of foreign policy discourse, not as humanitarian consideration but as existential necessity.

Conclusion

This research has demonstrated that mental health represents a critical but systematically overlooked dimension of contemporary foreign policy. Through examination of global mental health data, analysis of major international crises, and review of current diplomatic practices, the evidence indicates that psychological well-being constitutes a foundational factor in international stability that current frameworks inadequately address.

The proposed Psycho-Diplomacy framework offers a practical approach for incorporating psychological science into diplomatic practice. By training diplomatic personnel in trauma-informed negotiation, cognitive biases, group identity theory, behavioral economics, emotional intelligence, and intercultural sensitivity, foreign policy can become more effective at addressing root causes of instability rather than merely managing symptoms.

The time for incremental adjustments has passed. Contemporary challenges require revolutionary thinking about international relations. Our capacity to maintain stable, democratic societies depends on recognizing that mental health is not peripheral to foreign policy but central to it. The implementation of Psycho-Diplomacy represents

not idealism but pragmatic recognition that sustainable peace, prosperity, and cooperation depend fundamentally on the psychological well-being of populations worldwide.

REFERENCES

Albrecht, G., Sartore, G. M., Connor, L., Higginbotham, N., Freeman, S., Kelly, B., Stain, H., Tonna, A., & Pollard, G. (2007). Solastalgia: The distress caused by environmental change. *Australasian Psychiatry*, 15(Suppl 1), S95-S98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10398560701701288>

Bloom, D. E., Cafiero, E. T., Jané-Llopis, E., Abrahams-Gessel, S., Bloom, L. R., Fathima, S., Feigl, A. B., Gaziano, T., Mowafi, M., Pandya, A., Prettner, K., Rosenberg, L., Seligman, B., Stein, A. Z., & Weinstein, C. (2011). *The global economic burden of noncommunicable diseases*. World Economic Forum.

Böcker, A., & Kohls, M. (2017). *Integration of refugees in Germany: Current trends and development* (BAMF Brief Analysis No. 4). Federal Office for Migration and Refugees.

Chisholm, D., Sweeny, K., Sheehan, P., Rasmussen, B., Smit, F., Cuijpers, P., & Saxena, S. (2016). Scaling-up treatment of depression and anxiety: A global return on investment analysis. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 3(5), 415-424. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(16\)30024-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(16)30024-4)

Clayton, S. (2020). Climate anxiety: Psychological responses to climate change. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 74, 102263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2020.102263>

Cohen, R. (1997). *Negotiating across cultures: International communication in an interdependent world*. United States Institute of Peace Press.

Cottam, M. L., Mastors, E., Preston, T., & Dietz, B. (2015). *Introduction to political psychology* (3rd ed.). Psychology Press.

Cull, N. J. (2019). *Public diplomacy: Foundations for global engagement in the digital age*. Polity Press.

Fazel, M., Wheeler, J., & Danesh, J. (2012). Prevalence of serious mental disorder in 7000 refugees resettled in western countries: A



systematic review. *The Lancet*, 365(9467), 1309-1314. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)61027-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)61027-6)

Fernald, L. C., Hamad, R., Karlan, D., Ozer, E. J., & Zinman, J. (2008). Small individual loans and mental health: A randomized controlled trial among South African adults. *BMC Public Health*, 8(1), 409. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-8-409>

Fisher, R., & Shapiro, D. (2005). *Beyond reason: Using emotions as you negotiate*. Viking.

Goldstein, J., & Keohane, R. O. (1993). Ideas and foreign policy: An analytical framework. In J. Goldstein & R. O. Keohane (Eds.), *Ideas and foreign policy: Beliefs, institutions, and political change* (pp. 3-30). Cornell University Press.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.

Institute for Economics & Peace. (2023). *Global Peace Index 2023: Measuring peace in a complex world*. <http://visionofhumanity.org/resources>

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K., & Cook, J. (2017). Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the "post-truth" era. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 6(4), 353-369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2017.07.008>

Lund, C., Brooke-Sumner, C., Baingana, F., Baron, E. C., Breuer, E., Chandra, P., Haushofer, J., Herrman, H., Jordans, M., Kieling, C., Medina-Mora, M. E., Morgan, E., Omigbodun, O., Tol, W., Patel, V., & Saxena, S. (2018). Social determinants of mental disorders and the Sustainable Development Goals: A systematic review of reviews. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 5(4), 357-369. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(18\)30060-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30060-9)

Newman, N., Fletcher, R., Schulz, A., Andı, S., & Nielsen, R. K. (2020). *Reuters Institute digital news report 2020*. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.

Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C., Thornicroft, G., Baingana, F., Bolton, P., Chisholm, D., Collins, P. Y., Cooper, J. L., Eaton, J., Herrman, H., Herzallah, M. M., Huang, Y., Jordans, M. J. D., Kleinman, A., Medina-Mora, M. E., Morgan, E., Niaz, U., Omigbodun, O., ... Ünützer, J. (2018). The Lancet Commission on global mental health and sustainable development. *The Lancet*, 392(10157), 1553-1598. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31612-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31612-X)

Rigaud, K. K., de Sherbinin, A., Jones, B., Bergmann, J., Clement, V., Ober, K., Schewe, J., Adamo, S., McCusker, B., Heuser, S., & Midgley, A. (2018). *Groundswell: Preparing for internal climate migration*. World Bank.

Silove, D., Ventevogel, P., & Rees, S. (2017). The contemporary refugee crisis: An overview of mental health challenges. *World Psychiatry*, 16(2), 130-139. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20438>

Swim, J., Clayton, S., Doherty, T., Gifford, R., Howard, G., Reser, J., Stern, P., & Weber, E. (2011). *Psychology and global climate change: Addressing a multi-faceted phenomenon and set of challenges*. American Psychological Association.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Brooks/Cole.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Yale University Press.

Twenge, J. M., Joiner, T. E., Rogers, M. L., & Martin, G. N. (2018). Increases in depressive symptoms, suicide-related outcomes, and suicide rates among U.S. adolescents after 2010 and links to increased new media screen time. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702617723376>

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2023). *Global trends: Forced displacement in 2022*. UNHCR.

U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. (2022). *National veteran suicide prevention annual report*. U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.



Volkan, V. D. (2001). Transgenerational transmissions and chosen traumas: An aspect of large-group identity. *Group Analysis*, 34(1), 79-97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/05333160122077730>

World Health Organization. (2013). *Mental health action plan 2013-2020*. WHO.

World Health Organization. (2021). *Depression and other common mental disorders: Global health estimates*. WHO.

World Health Organization. (2022). *World mental health report: Transforming mental health for all*. WHO.

