

instance, skills are not dispersed in the same way they are in Norway or in Canada. A second requirement for New Diplomacy to work is a good relationship among different segments/components of society and the state (i.e., a good working relationship between intellectuals and NGOs with, say, the Ministry of Defence or Foreign Affairs). Third, financial capacity must exist. In the Norwegian case, the Foreign Minister had some experience with fund allocations through the Parliamentary process. A further prerequisite for New Diplomacy is a good relationship of Northern states with Southern states, usually established through development assistance.

In conclusion, Neumann argued that there has been a change in how states conduct their affairs. State has become "disaggregated." Actors in policy development and policy making are varied and often split themselves (i.e., the Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as the Norwegian Afghan Committee were all split internally at some point on the land mine issue). The circumstances are more complex than the simplistic dichotomy of state vs. NGOs. Rather than a chasm between state and society, policy making is characterised by various cleavages across the political, bureaucratic and socio-economic spectrum. Transnational civil society is incorporated into a complex process, it is no longer apart from it.

### **B) Comment and the Synopsis of the Discussion**

Elizabeth Riddell Dixon, University of Western Ontario, commented that the analyses generate a few important research questions. What are the parameters of action by alternative sources of leadership? What is a middle power by definition? Has there been some development in how we perceive the middle power concept and is there a need to redefine it as a variable in International Relations analyses? What is the impact of external environment/context on the conduct of New Diplomacy? Are partnerships functional or not? How do we rethink the state-centric approaches to International Relations, given the emergence of the disaggregated state? What is the role of individuals, business groups, the United Nations, the World Trade Organisation and other organisations and groups? What is the role of the Foreign Minister? Does New Diplomacy really create a space for a *meaningful* civil society participation in foreign policy? While there is no doubt that the participation of civil society organisations in foreign policy development/making has increased in recent years, it is dubious that they actually have real influence. Has there really been a shift towards a more democratic foreign policy process? Is there a chance of genuinely democratising the United Nations?

Others reflected on the contradictions of New Diplomacy. While it would appear that foreign policy making is disaggregated and uneven, the active participation of civil society organisations, including NGOs, experts, academics and others, adds coherence to the process. Another paradox of New Diplomacy rests in the fact that while the increased number of actors enhances the pluralistic nature of the foreign policy process it does not necessarily lead to its democratisation, since NGOs are neither representative of or non-accountable to citizens. While individuals are important, large NGOs are involved in the process on a much larger scale.