

power will be much more based on such things as the education and health of a country's population, its technological capacities, and the force of its ideas and cultural appeal.

It turns out that the distribution of such soft resources around the world, while skewed, is much less polarized than was military strength during the Cold War. In other words, many nations can be influential in at least some of the non-military fields, while at the same time most spheres (the military, the economic, etc.) have become more equal. The result is that solutions to the most pressing world problems can only be multilateral, even for the one remaining superpower, and "cooperation will often be needed from small, weak states."⁷³

The implications of Nye's analysis for diplomatic services and for individual diplomats are large. Nye writes of the new diplomacy, "Although force may sometimes play a role...new power resources, such as the capacity for effective communication and for developing and using multilateral institutions, may prove more relevant."⁷⁴ This "fragmentation of world politics into many spheres,"⁷⁵ without an overriding preoccupation such as security was during the Cold War, not only makes the classic arts of diplomacy, such as negotiation and communication, more important, but it may also upgrade the role of individual diplomats. Freed of an overriding lens through which all issues must be viewed, the individual diplomat, at all levels and in all posts, can be more creative in helping to solve real, if less glamorous, long-term problems. For example, an American observer has suggested that in a world of global linkages and budgetary restraint, the role of his country's diplomats will evolve from being big-spending influencers

73. *Ibid.*, p. 164.

74. *Ibid.*, p. 164.

75. *Ibid.*, p. 159.