

Another issue that is often ignored is the role of the business community within the New Diplomacy paradigm. Theoretically, the forms New Diplomacy take on should be outlined. Do NGOs merely nuance foreign policy or do they actually forge meaningful alliances with the state?

In response to the argument that the involvement of NGOs in foreign policy is inherently undemocratic, Neumann argued that such involvement helps form a base of a "consensus-oriented society." In such a society, the government draws on the expertise and experience of the civil society it serves. The process is legitimate as long as it remains transparent. Others have pointed out that given the growing overlap between domestic and international policies, NGOs not only reflect domestic issues but became instruments of foreign policy. The role of the media and new technology in the New Diplomacy "process" has been also stressed.

Some criticism was directed at the NGOs. A proposition was made that NGOs are currently experiencing a crisis of maturity. While they have achieved access they remain disoriented. There are too many of them in competition with each other. Business, traditionally not considered a part of the NGO/civil society sector, has been exerting more influence than ever within various policy mechanisms, including the UN. Therefore, consideration should be given to the role of business in political decision making. There seems to be a gap between the NGO's self image and reality. For example, the NRA has recently become an NGO. Is it desirable that such NGOs, with very narrow goals, should impact on the policy making process? Are pressure and interest groups NGOs and if so how is their legitimacy justified beyond the immediate community they represent? A need was identified to clearly define an NGO. What are the criteria for an organisation or a group to qualify as an NGO? What role does the source of funding play in such an identity? A first step to NGO categorisation should be to draw a distinction between advocacy NGOs and operational NGOs (with a wealth of on-the-ground experience in development or human rights, for example)..

The New Diplomacy paradigm has also been questioned on the grounds that despite some exceptions, the "great power" concept still dominates the international system. This is apparent from the clout of the G-8. Moreover, some argued that despite increased civil society involvement, the state remains the main variable in International Relations analyses. While NGO involvement may lend legitimacy to state action, NGOs are often co-opted by states for that particular reason. While New Diplomacy succeeded on some issues, it failed on others including, the establishment of fair labour standards within the framework of expanding international trade and debt forgiveness.

To counter the mounting scepticism about the ascendance of New Diplomacy, Bob Lawson, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, who worked on the Land Mines Treaty pointed out that the myriad of NGOs working on the land mines issue achieved a great deal of cohesion to fulfil their common goal. Why were the idiosyncrasies of the emergent system overcome and the campaign successful in this case? He argued that New Diplomacy lends itself well to "problem-solving." The land mines campaign worked because concrete