

'New-new' diplomacy

A new technological dawn

Robyn Ehryn Williams 

SaRCHI Chair: African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy,
University of Johannesburg
robynw@uj.ac.za

Abstract

DIPLOMACY is often characterised in terms of two phases: 'old' and 'new'. Old diplomacy dates from the era of Greek city-states until 1814, when the Congress of Vienna prompted a new phase in diplomacy. Both phases were influenced by trends in international relations, the needs of the state, and the tools that were available at the time. Old diplomacy was secretive, with a small pool of actors. New diplomacy was more open, with the introduction of multilateralism as well as non-state actors. Today, however, a wider array of actors and instruments is at play in international relations. This article argues that a third phase in diplomacy is unfolding, referred to as the 'new-new' diplomacy. This has been prompted by the fourth industrial revolution, as artificial intelligence, big data, and the Internet of Things have come to play a significant role. This article explores the nature of and trends in the 'new-new' diplomacy. It is qualitative, comprising desktop research. It explores primary and secondary literature and refers to several real-world examples that have become apparent over the past five years. The main finding is that contemporary global trends and the influence of advanced technology will not change the relevance of diplomacy and diplomatic agents, but will rather complement it. Diplomacy will remain resilient and agile.

Keywords: diplomacy, fourth industrial revolution, 4IR diplomacy.

Introduction

Diplomacy has long been a feature of human history, but has remained consistently agile. From Greek city states merely seeking to interact with one another to the Congress of Vienna, which eventually led to the establishment of the United Nations, and from formal envoys to Twitter diplomacy, diplomacy has evolved continuously, in line with globalisation and the emergence of international society. This article argues that a new phase in diplomacy – 'new-new' diplomacy – is currently emerging. It is strongly influenced by technology, and involves more non-state actors than before. Diplomacy is based on several well-established pillars, namely communication, interdependence, legal frameworks, and diplomatic actors. As the intersection of the fourth industrial revolution and diplomacy remains relatively new, it is important to understand in which ways diplomacy is impacted by advanced and emerging technologies. This is not the first time that technology intersects with diplomacy – for example, the advent of the radio and the rise of social media allowed state diplomacy to reach far wider audiences (Rawnsley 2016). However, the 4IR is a more disruptive force, as its technologies penetrate every corner of society, making its adoption an imperative. Previously, a handful of technologies were used to enhance diplomatic tasks and practices. However, the

rise of the 4IR has introduced an entirely new era of diplomacy in which technology is a significant driving force.

The article will begin by unpacking the concept of the fourth industrial revolution and its relevance to diplomacy, highlighting key technologies that may impact on diplomatic practice. It provides a historical overview of old and new diplomacy, with the trends and primary characteristics made visible. Next, it discusses 'new-new' diplomacy with a view to reaching a deeper understanding of how new and advanced technologies prompted by the 4IR are changing diplomacy. The study is purely qualitative, based on desktop research of primary and secondary literature in the form of journal articles, books, country reports and conference proceedings. Each pillar of diplomacy is individually analysed to allow a deeper understanding of how 4IR impacts on diplomatic practice.

The fourth industrial revolution

4IR continues to sweep the world, and penetrate various aspects of public and private life. Its disruption is unavoidable. Often referred to as Industry 4.0, 4IR may be understood as 'the digital revolution that has been occurring since the middle of the last century, characterised by a fusion of technologies that is blurring the lines between the physical, digital, and biological spheres' (WEF 2019). Primary technologies that dominate 4IR include artificial intelligence (AI), the Internet of Things, Big Data, Robotics and Information, and Information and Communications Technology (ICT). AI is one of the most transformational and impactful technologies. It is multidimensional, and may be applied in various ways. Furthermore, there is 'weak AI' and 'strong AI'- the difference between the two rests in the extensive abilities of the respective versions. Strong AI can act and think like a human, and could therefore construct a response to a particular scenario, while weak AI can only perform its intended reaction (Wisskerchen, Biacabe and Bormann et al 2017: 8).

Old and new diplomacy

There is no official date or event that marks the beginning of old diplomacy; however, the era of ancient Greek city-states is often regarded as its starting point. During this time, city-states mostly had low levels of interaction, and this was the primary purpose of diplomatic relations (Eilers 2006). Diplomacy was closed off and secretive, consisting of physical missions (Otte 2007). While it developed in some ways from the Greek period until the late 1800s, a common theme throughout was that relations were strictly bilateral, referred to as alliances and practiced only by diplomats (Géraud and Pertinax 1945).

New diplomacy erupted onto the scene of international relations at the Congress of Vienna. Held in 1814–1815, it was an international diplomatic conference to reconstitute the European political order after the downfall of the French Emperor Napoleon I. Essentially, it was a meeting of ambassadors of European states chaired by the Austrian statesman Klemens von Metternich, and held in Vienna from September 1814 to June 1815.

Another milestone was the formation of the League of Nations, the first worldwide intergovernmental organisation whose principal mission was to maintain world peace. It was founded on 10 January 1920 by the Paris Peace Conference that ended the First World War. It was initiated by United States President Woodrow Wilson, who emphasised the rise and significance of international collaboration among states (Morgenthau 1946). This marked a

new era of multilateralism, in which diplomacy became increasingly open, and later welcomed the inclusion of non-state actors such as non-government organisations and interest groups (Géraud and Pertinax 1945). The establishment of the United Nations in 1946, after World War Two, was a pivotal moment for new diplomacy, as it institutionalised engagement at a multilateral level, even when states did not engage bilaterally (Black 2010).

From the 1960s onwards, Africa's period of decolonisation propelled more states into global politics. The year 1961 saw the adoption of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, which set out an agreed framework for diplomatic relations among independent states. An initiative of the UN, it remains a cornerstone of modern international relations and international law and is almost universally ratified and observed. Despite the rapidly evolving nature of diplomatic practice, it has not been superseded.

Later, digital diplomacy became more prevalent. The concept is highly relevant to this article, as it is vital to acknowledge that the intersection of technology and diplomacy is not new; rather, it proves how agile diplomacy has been. According to Manor and Segev (2015), digital diplomacy may be defined as the execution of foreign policy using digital tools, such as social media platforms (Twitter and Facebook). However, 4IR has prompted an even more intensive use of digital tools and applications. The characteristics of 'old' and 'new' diplomacy are set out in the following table.

Table 1: Key features of old and new diplomacy

Characteristics	Old diplomacy	New diplomacy
Date	700BC- 1914	1919-Present
Nature	Closed	Open
Communication	Physical missions	Physical missions, telephonic calls, email.
Interdependence	Low levels of interaction, alliances. Bilateralism. The state is the primary actor	Multilateralism – states, non-state actors like international organisations and non-governmental organisations
Legislation	Congress of Vienna	Vienna Convention of Diplomatic Relations of 1963
Main Actors	Professional diplomats	Diplomats, international organisations.
Functions	To represent the state and achieve the foreign policy goals of the state.	To represent the state and achieve the foreign policy goals of the state.

Source: *The central features of old and new diplomacy (Williams 2021).*

New-new diplomacy: a new dawn

The continued penetration of advanced technologies into diplomacy and diplomatic relations marks a new era of diplomacy. Technologically speaking, the world is more interconnected now than ever before. Lines of distinction have faded over time, and this has implications for diplomacy. History has twice demonstrated that diplomacy may develop into a new phase due to new international trends, norms, and characteristics. Aspects of the latest phase are explored below.

Communication

According to Pilegaard (2017), emerging technologies will continue to influence the diplomacy into the future. The United States was one of the first countries to realise that technology could play a significant role in international relations, leading to the launch of several Virtual Presence Posts (VPPs), including Russia and the Maldives. VPPs are digital

extensions of diplomatic services and ease access to diplomatic information utilising ICT in the absence of physical embassies (Congressional Service Report 2019). Furthermore, VPPs allow diplomatic engagement to occur in smaller and more remote but significant regions.

New technologies, like big data, can be used to enhance traditional diplomatic functions, such as information-gathering and data analysis, leading to more rapidly assembled and more accurate information, and therefore improved service delivery (Hocking and Melissen 2015). These improvements may have major positive impacts in the areas of crises management and bilateral conflict. Moreover, the vast quantum of information provided by big data may result in faster and more appropriate decision-making in the wake of a crisis (Mazoni 2017).

Emerging technologies, and specifically ICT, enhance horizontal engagements, allowing citizens and other non-state actors to engage widely on online social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook (Bousfield 2019). These engagements mostly occur irrespective of state laws. However, some states have imposed a ban on some platforms, and closely monitor online engagement. Internet censorship has become common practice in Iran, where the government intermittently shuts down the internet == notably during the 2019 anti-government protests. However, this is not a new practice. In 2011, a few days after the launch of the US virtual embassy, Iran shut down the website in a hasty response to conflict (Reuters 2011).

ICT may further allow users or states to outpace their opponents. In 2014, during the #Occupycentral protests in Hong Kong, citizens feared the government would shut down the internet in order to disrupt communication among protestors and also their communication with the international community. However, use of the mobile application FireChat allowed protestors to communicate offline (Boehler 2014).

Lithuania has made a significant effort to utilise social media, notably Twitter, for foreign policy purposes (Dumčiuvienė 2016). The government has created a Twitter account, *Twiplomacy*, aimed at publicising and advancing its foreign policy objectives, and building the image of the state. Linas Linkevičius, a cabinet minister, tweets every day, sharing the state's objectives and posting upcoming events. Besides the accounts of Lithuania's foreign ministers and diplomats, diplomatic missions also have Twitter accounts.

The Chinese government has also begun to use Twitter, despite the fact that it is blocked in China. Various government representatives have official Twitter accounts, which have been described as 'confrontational' and 'informal'. In a virtual quarrel in 2019, a Chinese minister made allegations about racial discrimination experienced in Washington. Susan Rice, US ambassador to the UN, took umbrage, and called the Chinese official a 'racist disgrace' (*Bangkok Post* 2020). China was urged to utilise Twitter due to the increasingly adverse portrayal by the foreign media of the ongoing trade dispute between the US and China; the mass detention of Muslims in Xinjiang; US President Donald Trump's active use of Twitter; and the pro-democracy movement in Hong-Kong.

While increasingly popular, e-diplomacy is still in its infancy (Hare 2016: 289). Emerging technologies have become a useful tool for diplomats. E-diplomacy comprises the use of the internet and ICT to achieve diplomatic goals, including the digitisation of diplomatic practices and processes. According to Hanson (2012), it aids in information and knowledge management, public diplomacy, and disaster response.

Social media are widely considered to be the sole tool of e-diplomacy, but this is not the case. Crowd-sourcing, computer and mobile technology, mapping software, and text messaging all contribute to highly digitised and efficient e-diplomacy. Moreover, e-diplomacy is far cheaper than traditional diplomacy. Over the past five decades, the costs of computers, mobile devices and communication technologies have dropped dramatically, making these technologies more affordable and accessible to states, organisations and individuals Hare (2016). This has helped to open up diplomacy, as non-state actors have been drawn into diplomatic engagements, and states have become more responsive to citizens.

The rapid development of ICT has also required diplomacy to adapt to it as rapidly (Hare 2016). Continuous adaptation is difficult and time-consuming, with diplomats and other actors have to continue learning new skills and assimilating new knowledge.

According to Kurbalija (2013), the implications of e-diplomacy include the following:

1. Continuously developing emerging technologies have resulted in an ever evolving diplomatic environment, with further effects on the global economy;
2. Traditional diplomatic practice has transitioned to online spaces, and states have become increasingly reliant on the internet and further concerned with internet governance; and
3. Diplomatic agents should familiarise themselves with new tools and begin integrating these into diplomatic practice. Big data, natural language processing and social media can all enhance diplomatic activity.

E-diplomacy may be applied in many ways. In the wake of a crisis, whether man-made or natural, advanced ICTs allow for instant communication. Through emails, online meeting applications and social media, states have an instant and consistent channel of communication at their disposal. Emerging technologies also allows policy-makers, heads of state and diplomats to make informed and accurate decisions at a quicker pace. Kurbalija (2013) further states that digital tools allow citizens to be drawn into decision-making processes about foreign policy and diplomacy.

Al-Muftah et al (2018) conducted an extensive study of the social, political and economic factors that may hinder the implementation of e-diplomacy. Hindrances included resistance to change, secrecy, and a lack of financial resources. Many diplomats still prefer more private forms of diplomacy, and are therefore reluctant to engage in open diplomacy on social media, for example. Some diplomatic work involves sensitive information. Moreover, the integration of complex processes may make traditional positions and departments obsolete. For these and other reasons, diplomats and those who work within diplomatic institutions may be resistant to change. Some states also lack the financial resources to implement emerging technologies. Lastly, states may believe that e-diplomacy is not really essential, and prioritise spending on other areas of activity. They may therefore choose to not upgrade to newer, more advanced systems, thereby deferring the implementation of e-diplomacy.

Several significant changes must occur for diplomacy to remain relevant in a highly digitised environment (Tavares 2018). On the positive side, e-diplomacy can enhance accountability, and promote a positive reflection of the state. New ICT that are accessible to both private individuals and the state offer risks and opportunities for relations within and among states. It can significantly broaden access, allowing states to engage with foreign audiences and promote educational opportunities and visa applications through their websites. On the other

hand, it also provides new opportunities for attacks on the state. After a series of air strikes and ongoing tensions between the United States and Iran in early 2020, a private Iranian group utilised video distortion tools to create a deepfake of then US president Donald Trump. The video depicted a beaten and bruised Trump, along with a message that vowed to seek revenge for the death of Qassem Suleimani (France-Pressé 2020).

The Fourth Industrial Revolution also enables and promotes sentiment analysis. This is an algorithmic process that allows governments to develop a deeper and more accurate understanding of public opinion (McLellan 2017). Sentiment analysis efficiently processes real-time data during crises, or as vote counts take place during elections. Due to its volume, velocity and variety, Twitter is an ideal platform for sentiment analysis. It enables states to rapidly process the opinions of domestic and/or foreign audiences.

The British government has begun to use Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) to deepen its understanding of public opinion. LDA is similar to sentiment analysis as it establishes 'structured latent patterns from a sea of unstructured data' (Williams 2021: 80). According to Killbride (2020), sentiment analysis allowed a British organisation, Aylien, to analyse public opinion about Brexit. All news items about Brexit were collected. Positive and negative articles were separated, and the findings were numerically illustrated on a graph. The study explored both media within the United Kingdom and foreign media.

According to Gracie et al (2019), a special unit of the US Department of Defense, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), gathers and interprets big data to gauge threats and contribute to mission planning. It pulls a mass of data from different social media platforms, official websites and field reports. To ease the process and improve the potential results, DARPA created a Deep Exploration and Filtering of Text (DEFT) program, which utilises Natural Language Processing (NLP) to extract data automatically. This can be analysed and can help decision-makers to make more informed decisions.

Who are the diplomats?

While the role of diplomats has remained much the same, the individuals who represent the state or engage in international relations have evolved. According to Bull (1977), diplomats are responsible for forging and maintaining relationships among various actors, promoting the values, norms and rules of the state within international society. Charisma, non-bias, patience and fluency in several languages were widely regarded as the primary characteristics of a good diplomat (Nicolson 1998). Diplomats also need negotiation and mediation skills, the ability to protect the interests of the state and citizens in the diaspora, and the ability to gather, analyse and distribute information. Ambassador Al-Alawi (2019) has acknowledged the evolution of technology and its inclusion in diplomatic activities, stating that diplomats ought to learn more about data mining and should possess the ability to process much larger quantities of information.

Advanced technologies could benefit diplomats on a daily basis, helping them to do more in shorter periods. They can now micro manage their tasks, relations and information irrespective of time and distance, which would previously have been inhibiting factors (Hutchings and Suri 2020). On the other hand, as information is readily and publicly available, the reporting task of a diplomat may diminish. With the internet available just about anywhere in the world, and most citizens on social media, news about natural disasters, terrorist attacks, international political developments, and so on is almost instantly available. Therefore,

diplomats have far less time than previously to prepare a report about or response to breaking news. However, they still need to confirm the facts or accurate accounts of the events in question, as information can easily be falsified.

AI could drastically ease and enhance the daily activities of diplomats. According to Le Meir (2016), hashtags categorise subjects on social media in simple ways, thus allowing diplomats to easily access citizens' views on particular topics. AI may also improve negotiations and their outcomes, as it could help diplomats to analyse past experiences and explore alternative outcomes instead of making decisions based on insufficient facts and limited understandings (Grottola 2018). While it is evident that emerging tools may enhance the daily operations of a diplomat and speed up diplomatic processes, Cranston (2011) expresses concern over the costs of training diplomats to use these new tools. Moreover, given that digital technology is constantly advancing, diplomats would need to be almost continuously trained and retrained. Tavares (2020) points to the importance of companies such as Swissnex, a global science and technology initiative tasked with training diplomats in new technology, and providing them with innovation-related knowledge and skills. This is an attempt to ensure that diplomats are well equipped to deal with digital challenges, and able to utilise the new technology to improve international relations.

Interdependence

Diplomacy is more open than ever, and openly invites a multitude of actors to play an active role in diplomatic relations. States need one another, and the new technologies hold great promise for global development. While science diplomacy is not a new term, it is evolving and becoming more relevant. Described as 'scientific collaborations among states' (Hennessy, quoted in Williams 2021:46), it offers states new opportunities for addressing global challenges such as food insecurity, pandemics like Covid-19, and climate change. Science diplomacy has continued to evolve since the 1940s, when multilateralism began to develop more rapidly, and international conferences like the United Nations Climate Change Conference and the International Conference on AIDS and Sexually Transmitted Infections in Africa (ICASA) include discussions on how countries can utilise scientific collaboration to address global challenges. Diplomatic activities around science and technology include science exchange programmes and international webinars aimed at exploring joint solutions to global challenges

Legal frameworks

For decades, diplomatic activity has been governed by a single document: the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Activity of 1961. As noted previously, diplomacy has evolved in leaps and bounds, in lockstep with international trends and technological innovations, but the Convention has not been changed in line with evolving diplomatic practices.

Exponential technological development present states with significant and sustained foreign policy and security challenges (Turekian 2017). Therefore, states have to engage and collaborate on where to draw the line when implementing technology for diplomatic purposes, and define rules and norms for a digitised diplomatic environment. Frameworks have been developed for governing the international weapons trade and the spread of advanced technologies, it has been suggested that these should be extended to diplomatic practice as well. Given that these frameworks are general and non-specific, some territories and activities might not be covered.

While this may be suitable in the realms of war and cybersecurity, there are unanswered questions about what it means for Twitter diplomacy, internet bans that discourage freedom of speech, and the close examination of citizens' tweets by governments.

AI is highly complex and developing continuously, and has already injected itself into communications, military affairs, and international relations. According to the Group of Governmental Experts (2019), legislating AI should not be undertaken by coders and scientists alone, but should be a large collaborative effort involving social scientists, policy-makers, and originators of the technologies themselves. Involving all key actors in drafting new legislation for technology in international relations would ensure that all relevant aspects of diplomatic practice are considered. Besides drafting the legislation, overseeing the implementation of AI and ensuring that it does not breach any regulations is also a very important dimension.

According to Edelman (2020), states ought to acknowledge the potential of AI. Moreover, it is not AI itself that should be regulated, but rather its implementation. States would benefit by adapting AI policy at a national level to ensure its efficacy in both the public and private sectors. States should explore existing technology-related international frameworks and tailor them to suit diplomatic practice at an international level. This technique would offer states an existing policy foundation to work with. However, a general adaptation would not be advisable, and area-specific policy should be considered.

The Governance of International Spaces is legislation that attempts to regulate areas beyond national and traditional borders. These include outer space, Antarctica, and the high seas (The Royal Society 2010). It is impossible to traditionally govern international spaces, and agility is a notable trait that may ease the governance approach. States' multilateral cooperative approaches may aid in international space governance if it is done through scientific evidence and partnerships underpinned by science.

States such as Russia and the United States have begun to incorporate advanced technology and robotics in military practice. However, Russia has been more advanced and has openly stated that unmanned robots will soon replace human soldiers, and will be stronger, faster and more accurate (Spry 2020). The use of robots may also have negative consequences for international security, and may contravene Article 2.4 of the United Nations Charter that covers the timely and peaceful resolution of conflicts. There are various discussions surrounding the use of AI, particularly in global security. Singer (2009) has asked whether an AI-steered arms race should be halted before it gains momentum, and whether state-of-the-art technology (AI) should be allowed to destroy and kill in the absence of human input. Kirkpatrick (2016) believes weapons should not operate autonomously, and should require continued human input. These considerations should be taken into account in updating or creating new legal frameworks. The absence of human input could also raise questions about accountability when errors are made.

While there are numerous conversations around militarised AI, legislation aimed at governing its entry into global politics and international security is still lacking. In addition, AI is developing more and more rapidly, making it difficult for states to keep up and draft effective and relevant legislation (Michaelsons nd). Furthermore, while there is an urgent need to create an international framework for AI, policy-makers ought to strike a balance between encouraging innovation and protecting citizens. The UN has a notable history of establishing legal frameworks around new and advancing technology, including the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights (1997), and the Universal Declaration

on Bioethics and Human rights (2005). In the last few years, the UN and its advisory bodies have been working on a declaration about the application and ethics of AI.

Garcia (2019) notes that militarised AI technology and robotics may infringe existing frameworks, inciting more violence. On the other hand, Kirkpatrick (2016) points out that, as AI becomes more advanced, its accuracy is improved and less emotion is involved, which means that violence and disaster are less likely to occur. Most importantly, as policy-makers and scientists convene to formulate more up-to-date legislation surrounding AI, innovation and agility are principal considerations.

A new dawn

Research and analysis shows clearly that diplomacy remains relevant, but has evolved significantly due to the influence of advanced and emerging technologies that affect how tasks are performed, how humans engage, and offer new threats and possibilities.

Table 2: The three phases of diplomacy

	Old diplomacy	New diplomacy	New 'new' diplomacy
Date	700BC-1914	1919-2020	2020-
Nature	Closed	Open	More open
Communication	Physical missions	Physical missions, telephonic calls, email.	Physical missions, telephonic calls and social media.
Interdependence	Low levels of interaction, alliances. The state is the primary actor	Multilateralism– states, non-state actors such as international organisations and non-governmental organisations.	Multilateralism– states, non-state actors. Public citizens, businesses, interest groups.
Legislation	Treaty of Westphalia of 1648. Congress of Vienna of 1814.	Vienna Convention of Diplomatic Relations of 1963.	Vienna Convention of Diplomatic Relations of 1963– falls short in some areas.
Actors	Professional diplomats	Diplomats, international organisations	Diplomats, IOs, media, public, businesses, interest groups
Functions	To represent the state and achieve the foreign policy goals of the state.	To represent the state and achieve the foreign policy goals of the state.	To represent the state and achieve the foreign policy goals of the state.

The central features of old, new, and new 'new' diplomacy (Williams 2021).

'New-new' diplomacy is still in its infancy, but has already demonstrated how it differs from previous phases. It is more open than before, welcoming more non-state actors than new diplomacy, and very different from old diplomacy, which was highly secretive and closed off. Communication has evolved far beyond the early stages of diplomacy when physical missions, letters, and later telephone calls were the most common forms of engagement. In the last few years, we have witnessed a major development with states beginning to utilise social media to forge closer relations citizens in their own and other countries, but also to engage with heads of state and diplomatic representatives. Evidently, the use of social media is not directly related to the 4IR, and some may argue that relying on online applications such as Twitter and Facebook would have occurred irrespective of 4IR. However, tools such as natural language processing, the use of Hashtags to group and themes and discussions, and sentiment analysis may further spur the use of social media, as it allows states to develop a greater understanding of the views of citizens.

The new sense of openness and interdependence involves a plethora of new actors apart from the traditional states, international organisations and non-government organisations included in the new diplomacy. New actors include citizens, private businesses, scientists, innovators, universities and interest groups. The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 has served as the sole international framework for all three phases of diplomacy. However, as could be expected, it now falls short in various new areas, including territorial boundaries, cyphers and coding, that could have security implications. Diplomacy has also extended far beyond traditional diplomats and now include a range of actors who represent the state and engage in diplomatic activities at various levels. The crucial point is that diplomats are more relevant than ever. As noted previously, the world is highly integrated, and messages are easily lost in translation. While traditional characteristics – including certain personality traits – remain useful, diplomats today must be agile, able to adapt to the changing nature of diplomatic relations, and able to stay abreast of the new technologies that are rapidly being integrated into diplomatic practice.

This article has attempted to fill a gap in the literature by reviewing the intersection of the 4IR and diplomacy. In the process, it has sought to provide a conceptual framework for a new era in diplomacy and international relations. As critically explored throughout the article, the terrain of diplomacy is shifting continuously, and new practices are developing that do not fall under traditional diplomatic practice, making it necessary to offer a new frame. However, traditional diplomatic practices are still reflected today, presenting us with a mix of old and new diplomacy in current international relations. Therefore, the ‘new-new’ diplomacy does not erase the previous two phases, but rather constitutes an additional phase in which modern, digitised and 4IR-driven diplomatic actions come to the fore.

References

- Al-Alawi, H. 2019. ‘Qualities of a good diplomat’. *Diplomat Magazine*. At <http://www.diplomatmagazine.eu/>
- Al Muftah, H. 2018. ‘Factors influencing e-diplomacy implementation: exploring causal relationships using interpretive structural modelling.’ *Government Information Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2018.03.002>
- Bangkok Post*. 2020. “LOL!”: China’s informal, confrontational Twitter diplomacy. At <https://www.bangkokpost.com/>
- Boehler, P. 2014. “Off-the-grid” messaging application FireChat continues to ride Occupy boost’. *South China Morning Post*. At <https://www.scmp.com/news/>
- Bousfield, D. 2017. ‘Revisiting cyber-diplomacy: Canada-China relations online’. *Globalizations*, 14 (6), 1045-1059. At <https://www.tandfonline.com/>. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2017.1362176>
- Bull, H. 1977. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-24028-9_2
- Cranston, P. 2011. ‘Tools for 21st century diplomats.’ Diplo Foundation. At <https://www.diplomacy.edu/>
- Dumčiuvienė, A. 2016. ‘Twiplomacy: the meaning of social media to public diplomacy and foreign policy of Lithuania.’ *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lfpr-2016-0005>
- Edelman, R D. 2020. ‘Here’s how to regulate artificial intelligence properly’. *The Washington Post*. At <https://www.washingtonpost.com/>

- Alliance France–Presse. 2020. ‘US government agency website hacked by group claiming to be from Iran.’ *The Guardian*. At <https://www.theguardian.com/>
- Garcia, E. 2019. ‘The militarization of artificial intelligence: a wake-up call for the Global South.’ *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3452323>
- Géraud, André and Pertinax. ‘Diplomacy, Old and New’. *Foreign Affairs*, 23 (2), Council on Foreign Relations, 1945, 256–70. At <https://doi.org/10.2307/20029892>
- Gracie, M, W D Eggers and N Malik. 2019. ‘Using AI to unleash the power of unstructured government data’. *Deloitte Insights*. At <https://www2.deloitte.com/>
- Grottola, S. 2018. ‘Artificial Intelligence and Diplomacy: a new tool for diplomats?’ *Digital Watch*. At <https://dig.watch/>
- Group of Governmental Experts for Lethal Autonomous Weapons (LAW). 2019. Annual Report, Geneva, 25 September 2019. At <https://internet-governance-radar.de/en/>
- Hanson, F. 2012. ‘Revolution@State: The Spread of E-Diplomacy’. Lowry Institute for International Policy. At <https://www.brookings.edu/>
- Hare, P W. 2016. *Making Diplomacy Work: Intelligent Innovation for the Modern World*. United Kingdom: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483395944>
- Hennessey, E. 2019. ‘What is science diplomacy?’ *Biologist*, 66 (1), 26–29. Ar <http://0-search.ebscohost.com.ujlink.uj.ac.za/>
- Hocking, B and J Melissen. 2015. *Diplomacy in the Digital Age*. Clingendael Netherlands Institute for International Relations. Clingendael Report. At <https://www.clingendael.org/>
- Hutchings, R and J Suri. 2020. *Modern Diplomacy in Practice*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan. Avt <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26933-3>
- Killbride, E. 2020. ‘The Brexit saga: sentiment analysis of the story so far’. Aylien. At <https://blog.aylien.com/>
- Kirkpatrick, K. 2016. ‘Battling algorithmic bias: how do we ensure algorithms treat us fairly?’ *Commun. ACM* 59 (10), p16–17. At <https://doi.org/10.1145/2983270>
- Kurbalija, J. 2013. E-participation: opportunities and challenges. Presentation to the Diplo Foundation, Geneva. At <https://www.un.org/>
- Le Miere, C. 2016. *Maritime of Diplomacy in the 21st Century: Drivers and Challenges*. London: Routledge.
- Manor, I and C Segev. 2015. ‘America’s selfie: How the US portrays itself on its social media accounts’. In C Bjola & M Holmes (eds), *Digital diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. New York, NY: Routledge, 89–108.
- Mazoni, J. 2017. ‘Big data in government: the challenges and opportunities.’ Government of the United Kingdom. At <https://www.gov.uk/>
- McLellan, J M. 2017. ‘Sentiment analysis of real-time Twitter data’. *CDC Digital Magazine*, Spring/Summer 2017. At <https://scalar.usc.edu/>
- Michaelsons. N.d. ‘Artificial Intelligence Law’. At <https://www.michaelsons.com/>
- Morgenthau, H J. 1946. ‘Diplomacy’. *The Yale Law Journal*, 55 (5), 1067–1080. <https://doi.org/10.2307/792754>
- Nicolson, H. 1998. *Diplomacy*. Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Washington DC.
- Wilson, Woodrow. Fourteen Points Speech of 1918. At <http://www.ourdocuments.gov/>
- Otte, T G. 2004. ‘Old Diplomacy: Reflections on the Foreign Office before 1914’, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1361946042000259297>
- Pilegaard, J. 2017. ‘Virtually virtual?: The new frontiers of diplomacy’. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 12 (4) 316–336. At Brill <https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-12341356>

- Rawnsley, G D. 2016. 'Introduction to international broadcasting and public diplomacy in the 21st century'. *Media and Communications*, 4 (2), 42-45. <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v4i2.641>
- Reuters. 2011. 'US "virtual embassy" blocked by Iran net censor'. At <https://www.reuters.com/>
- Singer, P W. 2009. *Wired for War: The Robotics Revolution and 21st Century Conflict*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Spry, J. 2020. 'Will Russia deploy squads of robotic soldiers on the battlefield by 2025?' *SYFY Wire*. At <https://www.syfy.com/>
- Tavares, R. 2018. 'International diplomacy needs an overhaul to stay relevant: Here's why'. World Economic Forum. At <https://www.weforum.org/>
- The Congressional Service Report. 2019. US Overseas Diplomatic Presence: Background and Issues for Congress. At <https://fas.org/>
- The Royal Society. 2010. 'New Frontiers of Science Diplomacy: Navigating the changing balance of power'. American Association for the Advancement of Science. At <https://royalsociety.org/>
- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961.
- Williams, R. 2021. 'The implications of the fourth industrial revolution for diplomacy'. Masters Dissertation, University of Johannesburg. Available at <https://ujcontent.uj.ac.za/>
- Wisskerchen, G et al. 2017. *Artificial Intelligence and its Impact on the Workplace*. International Bar Association (IBA). Global Employment Institute.
- World Economic Forum. 2019. 'Centre for the Fourth Industrial Revolution', Network for Global Technology Governance. At <https://www.weforum.org/>