bilig
AUTUMN 2019/NUMBER 91
1-25

Turksoy, Turkic Council and Cultural Diplomacy: Transactionalism Revisited*

Erman Akıllı**

Abstract

This paper's aim is to read the process that crowned with the practice of cultural diplomacy thanks to TURKSOY and Turkic Council in Central Asia (especially in between Turkic republics and in general Turkic World) through Karl Deutch's "transactionalist" approach. In his book, "Political Community and the North Atlantic Area" Deutsch explains the transactionalist theory as a study that would enable "possible ways in which men someday might abolish war." So, the question is "How can men learn to act together to eliminate war/conflict as a social institution?". Therefore, also, this article is an attempt to answer this question with cultural diplomacy and cultural diplomacy implementations through international organizations such as TURKSOY and Turkic Council in the Turkic World.

Keywords

TURKSOY, Turkic Council, Cultural Diplomacy, Transactionalism, Karl Deutsch.

* Date of Arrival: 17 January 2019 – Date of Acceptance: 01 July 2019
You can refer to this article as follows:
Akıllı, Erman (2019). "TURKSOY, Turkic Council and Cultural Diplomacy: Transactionalism Revisited". *bilig – Journal of Social Sciences of the Turkic World* 91: 1-25.

** Assoc. Prof. Dr., Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, International Relations Department – Kırşehir/Turkey
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7782-0881
ermanakilli@ahievran.edu.tr

Introduction

During the Cold War years, interaction and communication in Central Asia, particularly in Central Asian Turkic states, were built up on bloc politics that led by Soviet Russia through the understanding of Soviet Union. After the dissolution of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and end of the Cold War, international politics got into a transition process in Worldwide. During this transition process; states needed to realign themselves and revise their foreign policy approaches towards to the new understanding in the World politics. According to this new understanding; bloc boundaries lost their limitation especially on post-Soviet countries. Through the shredded layers of *iron curtain*, new foreign policy opportunities aroused for all, around the World, but especially, for newly independent post-Soviet states.

Dissolution of USSR, also made it easier for new expansions both in terminology and institutional basis. Hence, new regional institutional approaches aroused in various regions such as: Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), BRICS, Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO), Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC), Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) and many different others. Nonetheless, thanks to the new expansions in the terminology, Turkic World term received a solid ground to construct on. Undoubtedly, one of the most recent and newest cases in institutionalization of international cooperation is the one in the Central Asia region known as the Turkic World. It is the concept that mainly implies six independent Turkic speaking states, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. In a broader understanding the Turkic World also includes many Turkic people that live in northern, eastern, central, and western Asia, northwestern China, and parts of Eastern Europe. Thanks to that kind of institutionalization, it occurred and manifested through various processes such as formal coordination, signing and legalization of international agreements, foundation of bureaucratic structures, modes of official discourses, dialogues and conventions on the grounds of Turkic World.

As a result of this occurring and manifesting process, TURKSOY, the International Organization of Turkic Culture was founded in 1993 by the Republic of Turkey, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and

Uzbekistan. Apart from its founding member states, TURKSOY also have observer members namely as: The Altai Republic (Russia Federation), The Republic of Bashkortostan (Russia Federation), The Autonomous Territorial Unit of Gagauzia (Moldova), The Khakas Republic (Russia Federation), The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, The Republic of Sakha-Yakutia (Russia Federation), The Republic of Tatarstan (Russia Federation) and The Tyva Republic (Russia Federation).

Referred to as the UNESCO of the Turkic World, TURKSOY is an international organization of cultural cooperation between its member countries, having been established on the basis of their common language, history and cultural values. Its main aims are to strengthen common bonds of heritage among Turkic peoples and to transmit and promote this heritage around the world. In other words, TURKSOY's activities, can be summed as practicing Cultural Diplomacy in the sphere of Turkic World.

Cultural Diplomacy can be described as course of actions, which are based on and utilize the exchange of ideas, values, traditions and other aspects of culture or identity. Through this exchange, relationships between states could be strengthen, sociocultural cooperation between states may be enhanced or mutual national interests could be promoted. As implied in the explanation of Cultural Diplomacy; TURKSOY's cultural and value-based activities enhances relations between Turkic states.

Aside from TURKSOY, on October 3, 2009 the leaders of four states, namely Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey have signed an agreement of cooperation between Turkic speaking states. This is reflected in a number of regional institutional innovations such as Turkic Council (the Cooperation Council of Turkic Speaking States) and its related institutions such as TURKPA (Parliamentary Assembly of Turkic Speaking States), International Turkic Academy, and the Turkic Business Council. Turkic Council has various of different activities but according to the cultural diplomacy basis "Orkhun Exchange Program" is a pivotal model for the Turkic World that enables student and staff exchange between Turkic states' universities. That exchange program makes it possible to form a common cultural and academic ground for Turkic World. Apart from that TURKSOY's activities as promoting common art, cultural figures, values and heritages of Turkic World strengthens relations between

the Turkic states on this manner. Hence, Cultural diplomacy establishes a two-way communication and trust with other countries. Nonetheless, through Cultural Diplomacy and cultural interaction might bring political interaction as well.

This paper's aim is to read the process that crowned with the practice of cultural diplomacy thanks to TURKSOY and Turkic Council in Central Asia (especially in between Turkic republics and in general Turkic World) through Karl Deutch's "transactionalist" approach. Meanwhile, no comprehensive analyses of these institutions, their foundations and development processes as well as the policies that have led to these outcomes have been carried out from academic perspective. Indeed, there are a number of written literatures solely emphasis on mentioned institutions, approaches and concepts separately; for instance, role of culture in foreign policy (Von Maltzahn 2015, Bound et al. 2007, Gould-Davies 2003, Cummings 2009, Barlas Bozkuş 2011) or regarding to the cultural diplomacy concept for states (Purtaş 2013a, Kitsou 2011, Guozuo 2017, Chartrand 1992, Sönmezoğlu et al. 2010, Schneider 2009, Gienow-Hecht & Donfried 2010, Feigenbaum 2001, Kozymka 2014, Vlahos 1991, Geertz 1973, Ateş et al. 2016), regarding to TURKSOY and Turkic Council, and more importantly an international organization's role on cultural diplomacy there are also a number on literature (Kozymka 2014, Purtaş 2013b, Ateş et al. 2016, Purtaş 2017, Durdular 2017) and about Deutsch's theory (Deutsch 1952, Deutsch 1957, Deutsch 1966, Ulusoy 2012, Adler 1997, Adler & Barnett 1998, Dedeoğlu 2004, Dedeoğlu 2016) also reviewed and magnified under the lens of security perspective. But none of them tried to explain the cultural diplomacy concept in Turkic world –that shines with TURKSOY and Turkic Council– through the lens of Deutsch's transactionalist approach. Therefore, this article is an attempt to realize a complex study of cultural diplomacy and transactionalism of international cooperation in the frames of the TURKSOY and Turkic Council. In his book, "Political Community and the North Atlantic Area" (Deutsch 1957); Karl W. Deutsch explains the transactionalist theory as a study that would enable "possible ways in which men someday might abolish war." So, the most important question is "How can men learn to act together to eliminate war as a social institution?" This study's main aim is to answer this question with cultural diplomacy and cultural diplomacy implementations through international organizations

such as TURKSOY and Turkic Council in the Turkic World.

(Post) Structuralist or Constructivist Return in the IR: Identity, Interaction and Culture

Dissolution of the USSR also had a huge impact on International Relations theories as well; during the Cold War years, Realist theory power/threat/security centric approach dominated the field. But with the wake of 1990s, another theory, the Constructivism emerged into the field which considers states like the Realist theory as the main actor of the international system and treats the international system at the structural level as predicted by the Neo-Realist theory. On the other hand, the theory argues that, contrary to the claim of Realism, states have no single and fixed understanding of national interests/foreign policy agendas, but that states have built their perceptions of national interest/ foreign policy agendas through their identities, culture(s) and values. Because these notions are, in the course of time, on the basis of political conjuncture, can be re-constructed and rebuilt (Smith 1991: 359) through social interaction, but they are vital for a state to take the necessary position against its friends and foes (Kowert 1998: 1). In other words, a state's identity, values and culture are the main components to image of the state so according to this image, position of the state in the international system could only be defined. Nonetheless, as Constructivism suggests, social interaction is the key element of the international system and this social interaction happens between states on the basis of their 'constructed' image.

Alexander Wendt, one of the leading academics of constructivist theory, emphasizes that the actors first define their image and then determine their target, purpose and action according to the image they define and, more accurately, determine their national interests (Wendt 1992: 424). In this context, what the actors do and what they do is directly related; more precisely, there is an organic link between the notion of image and foreign policy actions. However, according to Wendt, structures in the international system are not objective but rather the result of image and identity building as a result of interactions between subjects (Wendt 1994: 385). Nonetheless, Wendt argues that the structure of the system is not constant and that the anarchic structure is actually influenced by the constant interaction between the actors (Wendt 1992: 392). Also, constructed image is dependent with

the identity of the state. So, it's crucial to shed light on identity and its effect on foreign policy through the lens of Constructivism.

Contrary to Neo-Realists presume, Wendt says that values, identity and national interests are not imposed by structure of international system. In other words, construction of identity according to Constructivist theory is not an externally imposed form, but interactions of actors with one another. In other words, the existence of system-centered identity construction is emphasized; indeed, such algorithm can be applied to the domestic environment as well as to the international environment, and the internal cultural factors that constitute the state identity can be included in this process (Jepperson et al. 1996: 15).

According to Wendt, who advocates system-centered analysis, the behavior of states is formed on the basis of variables that take their essence from four different types of identity. These types of identity are; corporate, model (type), role and collective identities. According to Wendt, some of these identity types may change over time; however, the national interest understandings which states form on the basis of the corporate identities of their selves will be free from the general structure and the wind of change in the political conjuncture (Wendt 1994: 232-233).

According to Wendt, the core of the national interests created on the basis of the corporate identity, is the motivation of the existence of states. Hence, Wendt implies that these motivational interests are crucial that states need to attach great importance for their survival, which are; physical survival, autonomy, economic well-being and collective self-esteem (Wendt 1994: 234). The principle of physical survival is used to preserve the existence of a state-owned nation-state structure, but is generally used to preserve the boundaries. However, according to Wendt, this general use is not generally valid; for sometimes the states can tolerate the dissolution of borderline regions around them and the creation of new regional powers and/or borders within the state (Wendt 1994: 235). In this context, the basic element for the principle of physical survival is the preservation of the nation-state structure rather than the continuity of boundaries.

The principle of autonomy; means that a state can use its own resources on its own will and make constitutional/constituent agreements to which it is

a party (Wendt 1994: 235). In other words, the principle of autonomy is a state's ability to act as an autonomous actor in the international system. On the other hand, this principle is directly related to the independence of a country; a non-free state will not be able to meet the future demands from the country nor to respond to the future. However, according to Wendt, this principle implies an ambivalent situation, as in the same physical survival principle; because the elements necessary for the protection of independence will vary from situation to situation (Wendt 1994: 235-236).

Another principle that constitutes the national interest is the Economic Welfare Principle; The principle is defined as the continuation of the current economic order, the level of consistent/stable production and the conservation of economic resources. From a general point of view, the principle of Economic Prosperity is defined as growth-oriented; but this is not necessary, according to Wendt: There are economies in the world that are not growth-oriented but have a consistent level of production. According to him, the reason that growth focus is mandatory is that the Economic Welfare Principle is defined on the periphery of capitalist logic; for this reason, a legitimate basis can be provided to increase the financial interests (Wendt 1994: 235-236).

The final principle that constitutes the national interest is the principle of Common Self-Esteem; as a principle; it is expressed as a community feeling good. Respecting by the other means recognition; that is, if a state is respected by another state, the state's self-esteem will be positive; If the government does not see respect and recognition, self-esteem will be negative. In other words, there can only be cooperation between states of mutual respect and recognition; that is, the preservation of the principle of mutual respect is possible only by mutual respect and recognition. According to Wendt, these principles are the principles that built the national interest of a country, and it is seen that the principles mentioned in the above are similar to those of realist theory thinkers Robert Osgood's definition of national interest (Osgood 1953).

According to the Realist theory, interest is the *raison d'être* of the states in the international system. The core of the definition of national interest in the Neo-Liberalist theory constitutes the principle of cooperation in anarchic international system, which can affect the interests. According to the Neo-

Realist theory, the national interest is the whole of the actions that emerged from the external imposition of the (international) structure to the states. Constructivist theory defines states' perception of national interests as the result of identity building as a result of interactions between other subjects in the system. However, Wendt, argues that the notion of national interest rises on the basis of the principle of four main motivational interests. These principles are; physical survival, autonomy, economic well-being and collective self-esteem.

As mentioned in detail above, Constructivism defines international system as the result of social interaction between the states; and this interaction crowned by image which is summed by identity, value, culture. Apart from these notions, Realist theory explained the main drive for the states as national interest, in a power-driven international system. But according to the Constructivists, this main drive shapes the (international) system if it built upon identity, culture and values. In other words, so called social interaction actually a trade of positive 'image' that states constructed for their foreign policy goals. For this point, its crucial to shed light into the Deutschean theory, which crowns interaction, communication and integration for the ultimate salvation in the game of anarchy.

Karl Deutch's "Transactionalist" Approach

The origin of the transactionalism approach, which can be summarized as a theory, is based on Karl W. Deutsch's book 'Political Society and the North Atlantic'; It explains how the main purpose of political integration acts as a means to stabilize the state system and to prevent war and conflict with other states. Deutsch writes that there are two stages in international integration. The first phase he describes is a sort of pluralistic security community that 'feels' or does not exhibit any shared organization evoking a sense of community (Deutsch 1957: 127).

The transactionalist approach also aims at establishing an organized and interdependent community that is distinguished from the conditions necessary for the communication approach, the random grouping of individuals, and the support and maintenance of a sense of community between the population of a particular region. Deutsch's concepts and analytical vocabulary are largely derived from the theory of communication

and his previous work on nationalism (Deutsch 1953).

Core of the Deutsch's 'transactionalist' approach was the assumption that communication is the main binder of social groups in general and political communities in particular; he implies that communication enables a group to think together, to see together, and to act together (Deutsch 1966: 77). Deutsch also underlines that, through transactions such as trade, migration, tourism, culture, educational exchanges and the use of physical communication, a social fabric is built not only among elites but also the masses instilling in them a sense of community (Deutsch 1966: 78). As mentioned above, Deutsch's "transactionalist" approach enables regional integration for parties that share common grounds of communication, trade, migration, tourism, culture, educational exchanges and etc. (Deutsch 1966: 78).

In transactionalist theory approach; it's been underlined that more levels of transaction between regions lead to greater integration and greater political stability within the nation-state system. The theory is to explain how fragmentation can occur, as well as integration at an international and transnational stage. It tells us that these regions, which deal with each other, will lead to more fragmentation from different 'civilizations' and more integration than the same 'civilization'.

The second phase of integration that Deutsch describes is an amalgamated security community; in this phase, integration is similar to the pluralistic security community, with the notable difference that some organizations share, the pluralistic security community defined by Deutsch does not share any organization. A united security community can act as a single unit. There is a greater risk of conflict among individual members of the group, but at the same time there is a potential to act as a single unit. Because of this greater risk, the pluralistic security community seems to be a more viable option than the combined security community (Deutsch 1957: 128).

As Deutsch defines in two different phases of integration and defining which one can be preferred, he implies what's the meaning and sum of integration on the basis of stability. He expressed the feeling that the community needed for political integration should pursue beyond sharing common values. It must be a mutual sympathy and loyalty sensation called 'us'. People

must identify with one another. There must be mutual communication, common needs and mutual attention (Deutsch 1957: 129). In other words, transactionalism holds shared interests and values which are important for integration; also, it is the interaction and communication that leads to a level of integration which is encouraged by shared values, as well as leading to more integration.

The Catalyst: 'Cultural Diplomacy'

If one considers Soft Power concept as a body of a tree; branches of the tree should be Cultural Diplomacy, Public Diplomacy, Foreign Aids, Nation Branding and Digital Diplomacy (Akıllı 2016: 152). All these alt concepts are related to the Soft Power concept. Joseph Nye, who coined the Soft Power concept into International Relations literature with his famous book "Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power", explains "The ability to persuade through culture, values and ideas, as opposed to 'hard power', which conquers or coerces through military might" (Nye 1990: 34). Nonetheless, culture is on a higher plain than institutions, values, or efforts to secure a greater say in international affairs and to play a greater role in shaping World discourse in so far it imbues all these things and many beyond (Zhang 2017: 44).

Cultural Diplomacy can be described as course of actions, which are based on and utilize the exchange of ideas, values, traditions and other aspects of culture or identity. Through this exchange, relationships between states could be strengthen, socio cultural cooperation between states may be enhanced or mutual national interests could be promoted. Cultural Diplomacy can be practiced by either the public sector, private sector or civil society (Akıllı 2016: 153-4).

Another description of Cultural diplomacy as following is; "Cultural diplomacy represents a facet of diplomacy that has not been utilized completely in building better relationships and although it could serve as a linking bridge toward better relations…" (Kitsou 2011: 21). According to another definition of Cultural Diplomacy; "it is an actor's attempt to manage international relations by transferring its cultural resources and achievements abroad." The underlying assumption is that the political interaction will be easier between those who are close to each other

in cultural terms. Because of that, the scope of the term is hard to be determined correctly (Sönmezoğlu et al. 2010: 438). Generally speaking, it is accepted that cultural diplomacy owned by a state is mostly related to that state's government (Sancar 2012: 169). It is said that cultural diplomacy is one the most important instrument to advertise positive image facilitating diplomatic affairs (Chartrand 1992: 134). Cultural diplomacy, according to another definition; is the strategy of developing mutual understanding between states through human communication and exchange as a concept of international relations (Purtaş 2013a: 2).

Apart from that, Cultural Diplomacy is defined as a behavior introducing cultural advantage to audiences (Fisher 2009: 253-254). In this context, the importance of the message and the perception that is intended to transfer to audiences are revealed. So, having the potential to awaken curiosity and interest to the targeted state, messages given to audiences will in the future cause a barrier for a potential prejudice to targeted state (Sancar 2012: 170). More precisely, a country that can be influenced by another country's cultural values, makes it easy to accept the legitimacy of latter's foreign policy goals.

As Sancar emphasizes that the power of directing the masses without resorting to crude powers and persuading them to certain issues has risen in "language" (Sancar 2012: 170). In this context, countries using the Cultural Diplomacy instrument have two main elements on which they stand; namely language and education. It is much easier for a country to be effective in the target country or countries where it spreads its own language compared to other countries. On the other hand, education is used as a means of supplementing the language. Beyond the classical meaning of education, areas of arts and culture are also implemented into the definition. Countries that make the most use of cultural diplomacy are former colonialists; or, countries those of which can afford such activities in terms of their foreign policy goals (Sönmezoğlu et al. 2010: 438-439).

In other words, cultural diplomacy is an interaction and communication tool for states, that can be used to built up and promote common (cultural) values and (foreign policy) goals for each other. Regarding to this assumption, TURKSOY and Turkic Council's *est ratio* is to provide a common ground for Turkic World to create an integrated community. For doing so cultural

diplomacy interpretations, such as TURKSOY's activities and Turkic Council's cooperation areas (for instance, Orkhun Exchange Program) have been used. Of Corse, this kind of attempt is to realize that an integrated community (with communication and interaction) eventually provide a safe area that provident disputes/conflicts/wars as Deutsch suggested in his famous work (Deutsch 1957).

Turkic World's UNESCO: TURKSOY

After the dissolution of the USSR, newly independent Turkic states (Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan) pursued their state building on cultural basis (Purtaş 2017: 91) actually, that kind pursuit intercepts with Deutsch's approach of transactionalism. As Purtaş implies, through this culture-based state building led them to identify their identity both domestically and internationally (Purtaş 2017: 91). While a culture-based transformation happening in the very days of the independence for the Turkic states in Central Asia, TURKSOY founded to enhance this transformation and boost the relations between the mentioned states as well as Turkey. TURKSOY (The International Organization of Turkic Culture) was founded in 1993 by the Republic of Turkey, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. As title of this section resembles and since their fundamental principles, activities and goals (of intercultural cooperation) are the same, TURKSOY also referred as UNESCO of the Turkic Word, is an international organization that crowns cultural cooperation between its member and observer states. Every member state represented in the minister of Culture level in the organization. TURKSOY's corner stones based on common language, history and cultural values; through these values, TURKSOY enhancing relations between members by strengthening common bonds of the Turkic legacy (Purtaş 2017: 91-92). For doing so, TURKSOY is organizing commemorative events that crowns common Turkic culture and history as well as celebration of the Nowruz Feast.

Apart from these events, promoting common Turkic art takes an important place for TURKSOY's activities. Since TURKSOY is the very organization for dialogue and interaction for Turkic World, promoting art and forging bonds through it shapes TURKSOY's activities. Art is a universal language that can provide communication ground, even there

isn't any available to establish; thus, TURKSOY considers art is the crucial element for dialogue and communication and pays tremendous amount of importance in its activities. For doing so TURKSOY organized a number of art events starting from its foundation; 19 opera days, 10 photographer's gatherings, 5 sculptures' gatherings, 7 congresses of literature journals of the Turkic World, 3 Kashgarly Mahmut Short Story Competitions and 5 seminars on intangible cultural heritage; as well as with the exchange of repertoires, conductors and musicians among Turkic World Youth Chamber Orchestra (established in 2010) and Youth Choir (established in 2015) (Purtaş 2017: 99).

Apart from art, TURKSOY also promotes culture as the main ground for the dialogue and communication between its members; for instance, cultural capitals of Turkic World have been declared (like Astana, Kazakhstan at 2012). As representative of their national cultures, cultural capitals of Turkic World host many events during the year: from artistic gatherings to theatre, from classical music performances to various showcases (like Turkvision), being the cultural for a year provides the chance to introduce positive image of the country towards to World. Indeed, these events drastically increase the number of culture tourists as well.

Through the promotion of art TURKSOY both aimed to enhance the bonds in the Turkic World as well as introduce the uniqueness and richness of Turkic culture towards the rest of the World. Nonetheless, TURKSOY has been an international gateway for the post-Soviet Turkic States; hence they were behind the iron curtain's restrictions. Through TURKSOY, those states able to enhance their introduction to international system as well. Thanks to TURKSOY's activities, which provides a solid ground for cultural dialogue, interaction and communication, Turkic republics have successfully enforced policies to sustain peaceful coexistence as well as restoration, preservation, integration and promotion of the common culture (Purtaş 2017: 100).

TURKSOY's activities enable member states and most importantly for Turkic World, to build up a mutual ground with the norms of common cultural values and promoted it through cultural diplomacy activities. Today, member and observer states of TURKSOY are get to gather (as mentioned above) and have regular meetings in the basis of culture, art

and common values; this kind of interaction and communication added vital benefits for the dream of an integrated Turkic World.

Turkic Council and Orkhun Exchange Program

The Cooperation Council of the Turkish-speaking Countries (Turkish Council) is an intergovernmental structure that promotes cooperation in between the Turkic World. The organization was established with the Nakhichevan Agreement signed by Turkey, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan at the Turkish Summit in 2009, in Nakhichevan. The Turkic Council reflects the common political will of the member states and takes meetings at heads of states level (https://www.turkkon.org/en/organizasyon-tarihcesi).

Even though the organizational structure established at 2009, very first summit of the Turkic Council held at 1992 in Ankara. Beside from Turkey's, leaders of the newly independent states namely as Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan met at the summit. After the first summit, next one held at Istanbul in 1994; at Bishkek in 1995; at Tashkent in 1996; at Astana in 1998; at Baku in 2000; at Istanbul in 2001; at Antalya in 2006; Nakhichevan in 2009; at Istanbul in 2010; at Almaty between 20-21 October 2011 with the theme "Economic and Commercial Cooperation"; at Bishkek in between 22-23 August 2012 in Bishkek with the theme of "Educational, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation"; 15-16 August 2013 in Qabala District of Azerbaijan with the theme "Transportation"; at Bodrum in between 4-5 June 2014 with the theme of "Tourism"; and 11 September 2015 with the contact of Media and Information Technologies in Astana (http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turk-konseyi-en.en.mfa).

As it can be seen from these summits, Turkic Council acts as the top level of dialogue authority between the member states and thus, serves as the common ground for the Turkic World's mutual decisions. As an important aspect of the dialogue, education takes an important role in the Turkic Council too; starting from 2017 Orkhun Exchange Program enabled to provide students and academics to have an alternative type of exchange (like Erasmus+ KA107 and Mevlana Exchange Program) between Universities in the Turkic World. Orkhun Exchange Program, which provides student and academic staff exchange for higher education institutions of the Turkic

Council members, developed by the Turkish Council and its regulation signed by the member states meeting that held at Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University between 6-7 April 2017. (http://www.turkkon.org/en-US/Haber-Arsivi/301/1130/3822)

The pilot project of the Orkhun Exchange Program started in the first stage for undergraduate students in the Department of International Relations, Political Science, International Relations and Political Science from 2017-2018 academic year. Bilateral protocols between the participating universities have been signed in this context. Current Orkhun Exchange Program Universities are: Azerbaijan: Baku State University; Kazakhstan: International Hodja Ahmet Yesevi Turkish-Kazakh University, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, L.N. Gumilyev Eurasia National University; Kyrgyzstan: Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, International University of Kyrgyzstan; Turkey: Ataturk University, Istanbul University (http://turkunib.org/orhun/).

Orkhun Exchange Program has potential for future, but right now University numbers needed to be increased and students and academic staff at program Universities should be encouraged to take part in it. Nevertheless, Orkhun Exchange Program is one of the tools for the cultural diplomacy for the Turkic World had muster and shall be supported by the Turkic Council members for a more broader exchange program in University level. As Erasmus+ starting point, through Orkhun Exchange Program it would become a reality to form a solid common ground in higher education for Turkic World as well. In which, dialogue and interaction will be crowned and practiced in the community.

Organizations, Critiques and Deutschean Theory

As mentioned under the introduction title, the grand puzzle for this article is Deutsch's famous statement about the transactionalism as "the study of possible ways in which men might someday abolish war" (Deutsch 1957: 3). For solving this ultimate puzzle; its crucial to understand Deutsch expression (Deutsch 1957: 3-4) that within the security/political communities, the occurring and expectation of war is minimized. On the other words, erupting war (or/and conflict) in -politically- integrated communities are less likely considering to nonintegrated or less communicated regions/countries.

In the core of transactionalism, the idea is simple and understood: To end the ongoing game of mutual mistrust within the anarchic international system, states had to transform the system of anarchy by building mutually binding norms for peaceful ways of competition. Self-interested actors would not give up their interests, but socialize themselves respectively each other to non-violent mode of conduct (Beyer 2005: 2). As mentioned above, in transactionalist theory approach; it's been underlined that more levels of transaction between regions lead to greater integration and greater political stability within the nation-state system; these regions, which deal with each other, will lead to more fragmentation from different 'civilizations' and more integration than the same 'civilization'. Thus, communication as the key mechanism of the social mobilization of communities that in turn was responsible for historical process of national development. Similar processes in the international sphere in circumstances where states build security communities among themselves. international integration is defined as the achievement of security within a region. Deutsch, defined integration as 'the attainment, within a territory, of a "sense of community" and of institutions and practices strong enough and widespread enough to assure for a "long" time, dependable expectations of "peaceful change" among its population (Deutsch 1957: 5) In other words, communication and interaction will eventually lead integration; and it will provide a mutual relevance between states that create a beneficial interaction ultimately to state trust for each other. Foundation of TURKSOY enabled a habitat to share common cultural values of Turkic World, created a platform that states represented in Ministry of Culture level. Same situation goes for the Turkic Council as well, in which states represented by Ministry of Foreign Affairs; both institutions (TURKSOY and Turkic Council) are provided safe and solidary ground for their member states.

Beyer explains main target of the security community approach in the international relations is to theorize how to prevent conflict between states; of course, it's important to keep in mind that Deutsch theorized this approach during the Cold War years, in which International Relations dominated by Realist theory. So, the core drive of the theory actually crowned with the Realist approach's assumptions of staying alive for a state; which is being 'power'ful (in manners of military and economic). Beyer explains this situation as a nation's survival constitutes the interest

of the self-help dominated actors (states) and in the presence of universal mistrust which driven by Realist theory's anarchical international system identification, may eventually lead to provident violence in the instant of uncertainty such as systemic changes (Beyer 2005: 1-2). For this study's case, a critical systemic change is undoubtedly the dissolution of USSR which led a massive uncertainty process for the ex-Soviet Union states. After the dissolution, being a nation-state for those states, also brought the situation of national interest that eventually caused disagreements once allied states in the Soviet Union. Instances like south Kyrgyzstan ethnic clashes or political and economic disagreements on the usage of Amu Darya and Syr Darya rivers shows us that uncertainty and being a newly independent state causes national interest driven problems. Thus, foundation of TURKSOY and Turkic Council were so crucial to surpass/consolidate such problems in the Turkic World. As Beyer suggests, rationalist states pursued their security under the shade of cooperation (Beyer 2005: 1-2); for Turkic World, mentioned organizations are huge and strong steps for the long-lasting cooperation and permanent communication bridges between the states. Beyer summarizes Deutsch work as trying to sketch a roadmap for states that will show a way out of the realist paradigm enhanced security trap of anarchy simply by integration (Beyer 2005: 2). In other words, to end the anarchy (in a Realist perspective, which international system imposes) and game of mis-trust is to build mutually binding norms for peaceful ways of cooperation and competition (Beyer 2005: 2). TURKSOY built on mutually shared cultural values and the one of the main aims of the TURKSOY in to promote this very common cultural values around the World. Nonetheless, Turkic Council built on mutually shared goals (areas of cooperation). Turkic Council provides cooperation grounds from political cooperation to economic cooperation; from youth & sports to education & science; from transports and customs to tourism and diaspora; and from ICT to information & media areas (*Turkic Council Annual Report*, 2017). As Deutsch offers, a mutual cooperation ground(s) with the support of communication and interaction will eventually end up with integration and this will create the security community that will ultimately prevent violence/conflicts/wars.

Deutsch offers two answers: One approach aimed at a pluralistic security community and starts with intensification of communication and

cooperation. By that, states would initiate a dynamic process of social learning and begin to form a set of shared norms. The second step demands that states had to subdue to some kind of supranational body that would bind all of them and thus provide predictability necessary for the dependable expectation of peaceful change. The amalgamated community in analogy to the nation state confers decision making power from the multilateral to the supranational level (Beyer 2005: 3). TURKSOY and Turkic Council are pioneering organizations towards a communication crowned Turkic World; that approach also brought interaction between the Turkic states. As summed above; communication and interaction create a strong sense of integration between the states.

On the other hand, there are also a number of critiques towards to Deutsch transactionalism approach; such as Adler & Barnett: security/political community concept revisited and a new approach developed by Adler & Barnett (1998). In their study, Adler & Barnett suggested a new tree tier structure to explain the mentioned community model. According to Adler & Barnett, Deutschean concept of transactionalism has major flaws, they consider it as fuzzy and badly defined (Adler & Barnett 1998: 29). Their critiques concentrated on some points, which are summed as below: Problems of measurement and operationalization, lack of clarity on mechanisms which the key processes operate, lack of evidence to support the assumption that increased communication would necessarily lead to cognitive change (Adler & Barnett 1998: 29-65). Adler & Barnett defines community in three characteristics: First, shared identities, values and meanings; second, many-sided and direct relations; third, communities exhibit a certain kind of reciprocity that expresses some degree of long-term interest (Adler & Barnett 1998: 31). TURKSOY promotes the common cultural identity of Turkic (member) states (first characteristic); Turkic Council provides a common ground that multi-faceted relations can be aroused (second characteristic); and TURKSOY and Turkic Council both enabled Turkic World states to have mutual and multi-faceted relations between one and another; thus, helped to create and promote an integrated community in the basis of cultural diplomacy (third characteristic).

Conclusion

In this paper its aimed to read the process that crowned with the practice of cultural diplomacy in Central Asia (especially in between Turkic republics and in general Turkic World) through Karl Deutch's "transactionalist" approach. At the heart of Deutsch's transactional approach is the assumption that the communication is the cement of social group in general and political communities in particular. Communication enables a group to think together, to see together and to act together. Communication process and transaction a flow helps spread shared identification among people. Through transactions such as trade, migration, tourism, culture, educational exchanges and the use of physical communication facility, a social fabric is built not only among elites but also the masses instilling in them a sense of community. Through cultural diplomacy TURKSOY is the pioneer institution for this type of exchange; furthermore, Turkic Council's "Orkhun Exchange Program" provides educational exchange as for those states as well. TURKSOY and Turkic Council's Cultural Diplomacy activities will ultimately deliver positive image of countries that may facilitate diplomatic affairs. (For the facilitation example of the culture please check: Güzelipek 2017: 773).

On the other hand, sense of community is defined by Deutsch as a belief on the part of individuals in a group that they have come to agreement on at least this one point- that common social problems must and can be resolved by processes of peaceful change. Peaceful change is the resolution of social problems normally by institutionalized procedure without resort to large scale physical force. The formation of a security community is the central concept of transactionalism. There is real assurance that the members of that community will not fight each other physically but will settle their disputes in some other way and establish integration. This point also so crucial for Turkic World; because after the independence, naturally each state wanted to maximize their national interest goals and that caused critical problems between states. For instance, Central Asia's two major rivers, the Amu Darya and the Syr Darya's usage share between Turkic states has been a critical problem since their independence and now it's one of the biggest water and energy conflicts in Central Asia region (Lillis 2012). As mentioned under the introduction title, the grand puzzle for this article is Deutsch's famous

statement about his theory as "the study of possible ways in which men might someday abolish war"; practice of Cultural Diplomacy also would catalyst these kind of critical problems between states and through this catalyst a solid common ground for states will be stated for a long-lasting cooperation and stability in the relations.

References

Adler, Emanuel (1997). "Imagined (Security) Communities: Cognitive Regions in International Relations". *Millennium: Journal of International Relations* 26 (2): 249-277.

Adler, Emanuel & Michael Barnett (Ed.) (1998). *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Akıllı, Erman (2016). *Türkiye'de Devlet Kimliği ve Dış Politika*. 2nd Edition. Ankara: Nobel Yay.

Ateş, Şerif, Ş. Köktürk & M. Barut (Ed.) (2016). *Kültürel Diplomaside Sınırların Dışında Düşünmek*. İstanbul: Yunus Emre Enstitüsü Kültürel Diplomasi Akademisi Yay.

Barlas Bozkuş, Şeyda (2011). "Kültür Diplomasisinin Sınırları: Türk Kültür ve Sanatının Uluslararası Platformlarda Tanıtımı (1980-2010)". *Global Media Journal* 2 (3): 1-19. http://globalmediajournaltr.yeditepe.edu.tr/makaleler/GMJ_3._sayi_Guz_2011/PDF/Bozkus.pdf (Accessed: 14.03.2019).

Beyer, Cornelia (2005). "A Presentation of Emanuel Adler's Concepts of Integration". *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations* 4 (3): 1-20.

Bound, Kirsten, R. Briggs, J. Holden & S. Jones (2007). *Cultural Diplomacy*. London: Demos.

Chartrand, Harry Hillman (1992). "International Cultural Affairs: A Fourteen Country Survey". *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 22 (2). http://www.compilerpress.ca/Cultural%20Economics/Works/ICR%201992.htm (Accessed: 20.07.2018)

Cummings, Milton C. (2009). *Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey*. Washington: Americans for the Arts. https://www.americansforthearts.org/sites/default/files/MCCpaper.pdf (Accessed: 14.03.2019).

Dedeoğlu, Beril (2004). "Yeniden Güvenlik Topluluğu: Benzerliklerin Karşılıklı Bağımlılığından Farklılıkların Birlikteliğine". *Uluslararası İlişkiler* 1 (4): 1-21.

Dedeoğlu, Beril (2016). *Uluslararası Güvenlik ve Strateji.* 3rd Edition. İstanbul: Derin Yay.

Deutsch, W. Karl (1953). *Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality*. Cambridge: The Technology Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Deutsch, W. Karl (1957). *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Deutsch, W. Karl (1966). *The Nerves of Government*. New York: The Free Press.

Durdular, Ercan (2017). "Parliamentary Assembly of Turkic-Speaking Countries (TurkPA): Beyond Parliamentary Diplomacy". *Perceptions* 22 (1): 115-142.

Feigenbaum, Harvey B. (2001). "Globalization and Cultural Diplomacy". *Center for Arts and Culture Art, Culture & the National Agenda Issue Paper*. Washington: George Washington University. 1-29.

Fisher, Ali (2009). "Four Seasons in One Day: The Crowded House of Public Diplomacy in the UK". *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy.* Ed. Taylor P. and Snow N. New York: Routledge. 252-261.

Geertz, Clifford (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Gienow-Hecht, C. E. Jessica & Mark C. Donfried (2010). *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Gould-Davies, Nigel (2003). "The Logic of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy". *Diplomatic History* 27 (2): 193-214.

Guozuo, Zhang (2017). *Research Outline for China's Cultural Soft Power*. Singapore: Springer.

Güzelipek, Yiğit Anıl (2017). "'Kosova ABD'nin 51. Eyaleti' Söyleminin Medeniyetler Çatışması ve (Neo) Realizm Özelinde Karşılaştırmalı Tahlili". *Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi* 7 (13): 761-779.

"History of Organization, The Cooperation Council of The Turkic Speaking States" (Turkic Council). https://www.turkkon.org/en/organizasyon-tarihcesi (Accessed: 20.07.2018)

Jepperson, Ronald L., Alexander Wendt & Peter J. Katzenstein. "Norms, Identity and Culture in National Security". *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics.* Ed. Peter J. Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press. 1-36.

Kitsou, Sofia (2011). *The Power of Culture in Diplomacy: The Case of U.S. Cultural Diplomacy in France and Germany*. Ionian University. http://www.exchangediplomacy.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/3.-Sofia-Kitsou_The-Power-of-Culture-in-Diplomacy-The-Case-of-U.S.-Cultural-Diplomacy-in-France-and-Germany.pdf (Accessed: 16.02.2018).

Kowert, Paul A. (1998). "National Identity: Inside and Out". *Security Studies* 8 (2-3): 1-34.

Kozymka, Irena (2014). *The Diplomacy of Culture: The Role of UNESCO in Sustaining Cultural Diversity*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Lillis, Joanna (2012). "Uzbekistan Leader Warns of Water Wars in Central Asia". *Eurasia Net*. https://eurasianet.org/s/uzbekistan-leader-warns-of-water-wars-in-central-asia (Accessed: 20.07.2018).

Nye, Joseph. S. (1990). *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. New York: Basic Books.

Nye, Joseph. S. (2002). *The Paradox of American Power*. New York: Oxford University Press.

"Orhun Process Exchange Program is Now at Service of the Turkic Academic World!". *TurkicCouncil*.http://www.turkkon.org/en-US/Haber-Arsivi/301/1130/3822 (Accessed: 20.07.2018).

Osgood, Robert (1953). *Ideals and Self-Interests in America's Foreign Relations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Purtaş, Fırat (2013a). "Türk Dış Politikasının Yükselen Değeri: Kültürel Diplomasi". *Gazi Akademik Bakış* 7 (13): 1-14.

Purtaş, Fırat (2013b). "Kültürel Diplomasi ve Türksoy". *Medeniyet ve Kültür Araştırmaları Merkezi*. http://mekam.org/mekam/kulturel-diplomasi-ve-turksoy (Accessed: 21.02.2018).

Purtaş, Fırat (2017). "Cultural Diplomacy Initiatives of Turkic Republics". *Perceptions* 22 (1): 91-114.

Sancar, G. Aslı (2012). *Kamu Diplomasisi ve Uluslararası Halkla* İlişkiler. İstanbul: Beta Yay.

Smith, Anthony (1991). "The Nation: Invented, Imagined, Reconstructed". *Journal of International Studies* 20 (3): 353-368.

Schneider, Cynthia P. (2009). "The Unrealized Potential of Cultural Diplomacy: "Best Practices" and What Could Be, If Only…". *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 39 (4): 260-279.

Sönmezoğlu, Faruk, Deniz Ülke Arıboğan ve Beril Dedeoğlu (Ed.) (2010). "Kültürel Diplomasi". *Uluslararası İlişkiler Sözlüğü*. 4th Edition. İstanbul: Der Yay.

"The Cooperation Council of Turkic Speaking States". *Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs*. http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turk-konseyi-en.en.mfa (Accessed: 20.07.2018).

Turkic Council Annual Report 2017. Turkic Council. https://www.turkkon.org/assets/pdf/yayinlar/turk-konseyi-2017-faaliyet-raporu-8-en.pdf (Accessed: 14.03.2019).

Ulusoy, Hasan (2012). "Revisiting Security Communities After the Cold War: The Constructivist Perspective". *SAM*. http://sam.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Hasan-Ulusoy3.pdf (Accessed: 14.03.2019).

Vlahos, Michael (1991). "Culture and Foreign Policy". *Foreign Policy* 82: 59-78.

Von Maltzahn, Nadia (2015). *The Syria-Iran Axis: Cultural Diplomacy and International Relations in the Middle East.* New York: I. B. Tauris.

Wendt, Alexander (1992). "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics". *International Organization* 46 (2): 391-425.

Wendt, Alexander (1994). "Collective Identity Formation and the International State". *American Political Science Review* 88 (2): 384-396.

Türksoy, Türk Keneşi ve Kültürel Diplomasi: İşlevselciliğin Yeniden Tahayyülü*

Erman Akıllı**

Öz

Bu makalenin amacı, TÜRKSOY ve Türk Keneşi sayesinde Orta Asya'da (özellikle Türk cumhuriyetleri arasında ve genel olarak Türk Dünyası'nda) kültürel diplomasi pratiğiyle taçlandırılan etkileşim sürecinin Karl Deutch'un "işlevselcilik" yaklaşımıyla incelenmesidir. "Siyasal Toplum ve Kuzey Atlantik Bölgesi" adlı kitabında Deutsch, işlevselcilik yaklaşımını "bir gün (insanlığın) savaşı ortadan kaldırmasını mümkün kılacak" bir çalışma olarak açıklamaktadır. Öyleyse, burada sorulması gereken temel soru insanların, sosyal bir yapı içerisinde birlikte hareket ederek savaş/çatışma ihtimalini ortadan kaldırmayı nasıl öğreneceği sorusudur. Bu bağlamda, çalışmada Türk Dünyası'nda TÜRKSOY ve Türk Konseyi gibi uluslararası kuruluşlar aracılığıyla kültürel diplomasi ve kültürel diplomasi uygulamaları ile bu sorunun cevaplanması da amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

TÜRKSOY, Türk Keneşi, Kültürel Diplomasi, İşlevselcilik, Karl Deutsch.

* Geliş Tarihi: 17 Ocak 2019 – Kabul Tarihi: 01 Temmuz 2019
Bu makaleyi şu şekilde kaynak gösterebilirsiniz:
Akıllı, Erman (2019). "TURKSOY, Turkic Council and Cultural Diplomacy: Transactionalism Revisited". *bilig – Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 91: 1-25.

** Doç. Dr., Kırşehir Ahi Evran Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü – Kırşehir/Türkiye
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7782-0881
ermanakilli@ahievran.edu.tr

ТЮРКСОЙ, ТЮРКСКИЙ СОВЕТ И КУЛЬТУРНАЯ ДИПЛОМАТИЯ: ПЕРЕСМОТР ТРАНЗАКЦИОНАЛИЗМА*

Эрман АКЫЛЛЫ**

Аннотация

Цель этой статьи – рассмотреть процесс в Центральной Азии, который увенчался практикой культурной дипломатии благодаря ТЮРКСОЙ и Тюркскому совету (в особенности между тюркскими республиками и в тюркском мире в целом) в контексте концепции транзакционализма Карла Дойча. В своей книге «Политическое сообщество и североатлантический регион» Дойч объясняет теорию транзакций как исследование, которое позволило бы «возможным путям, когда мужчины когда-нибудь могут отменить войну». Итак, вопрос в том, «Как люди могут научиться действовать сообща, чтобы устранить войну / конфликт как социальный институт?». Таким образом, эта статья также является попыткой ответить на этот вопрос путем внедрения культурной дипломатии и культурной дипломатии через международные организации, такие как ТЮРКСОЙ и Тюркский совет в тюркском мире.

Ключевые слова

ТЮРКСОЙ, Тюркский совет, культурная дипломатия, транзакционализм, Карл Дойч.

* Поступило в редакцию: 17 января 2019 г. – Принято в номер: 01 июля 2019 г.
Ссылка на статью:
Akıllı, Erman (2019). "TURKSOY, Turkic Council and Cultural Diplomacy: Transactionalism Revisited". *bilig – Журнал Гуманитарных Наук Тюркского Мира* 91: 1-25.

** Доц., д-р, Университет Ахи Эвран, г. Кыршехир, кафедра международных отношений– Кыршехир/ Турция
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7782-0881,
ermanakilli@ahievran.edu.tr.