THE PUBLIC DIPLOMACY OF TOMORROW
In recent years there has been a striking resurgence of international interest in public diplomacy (PD). Foreign ministries, universities, think tanks, and consultants have engaged with the practice with marked enthusiasm. A profusion of new programmes, courses, books, journals, articles, and conference panels have bolstered a burgeoning literature and provided form and direction to this renaissance. Drawing on insights gleaned from the fields of international relations, public administration, communications, political science, and anthropology, amongst others, public diplomacy may even be emerging as a new academic discipline.

I am a strong proponent of PD, especially as an alternative to traditional, state-to-state diplomacy or—and all the more so—to sending in the marines. After 11 September 2001, many governments have returned to the use of armed force, especially in prosecuting the U.S.-led Global War on Terror. The means of violence are readily available, and the ongoing militarization of international policy has corresponded with the agenda of certain powerful special interest groups.

In my view, the military has proven a rather blunt, costly, and in important respects inappropriate instrument in dealing with the essential threats and challenges associated with the globalization age. The results of relying on defence rather than diplomacy or development have been mixed, if not counter-productive—rather like using a hammer when a scalpel, or an outstretched hand, was required. Whether in Iraq for the US, Afghanistan for NATO, Darfur for the African Union, or Gaza for Israel, the balance of experience to date indicates that, notwithstanding recent efforts to update and re-tune counterinsurgency doctrine, armies are not the most effective option to resolve complex differences or to achieve ambitious political goals.

Treating terrorists as criminals, rather than dignifying them as warriors, would place a much greater reliance on police and intelligence