

ARTICLE

A New Era in Diplomacy: The Case of the Antalya Diplomacy Forum

Ahmet Nazmi ÜSTE* & Ulviyye SANILI AYDIN**

Abstract

This article aims to research the reasons necessitating new methods in diplomacy. Diplomacy is evolving and its language and methods are changing due to new fluctuations in global politics compounded by the Covid-19 pandemic. The study argues that the evolving nature of international society and its current agenda generate a symbiotic environment in diplomacy, requiring the adoption of new methods and approaches. In this context, the Antalya Diplomacy Forum, established as a platform where various experts, stakeholders and decisionmakers have an opportunity to discuss significant global and regional challenges, find solutions and exchange ideas, may be considered one of the best examples of innovative diplomatic methods in the new global era.

Keywords

Antalya Diplomacy Forum, diplomatic symbiosis, global governance, international society, new diplomacy

* Assistant Professor, Dokuz Eylül University, Department of Public Administration, İzmir, Türkiye. E-mail: nazmiuste@windowslive.com. ORCID: 0000-0002-4638-6629.

** Associate Professor, Celal Bayar University, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Manisa, Türkiye. E-mail: ulaydin91@hotmail.com. ORCID: 0000-0002-6713-5917.

Received on: 02.07.2022

Accepted on: 26.10.2022

Introduction

Diplomacy is one of the most important and well-known foreign policy tools used by states to implement their foreign policy decisions. All of the specific actions and methods of any international legal actor regarding its foreign policy are defined as diplomacy.¹ The concept has never diminished in importance due to the fact that interstate relations, the international system and global politics are constantly evolving into new dimensions and confronting new issues and challenges.

The phenomenon of “globalization” forced many to think intently about the links and dependencies between the actors of global politics.² In the 21st century, particularly in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic, radical changes in the paradigm of global politics have multiplied. Although international politics was based on the interaction between states and international organizations until the middle of the 20th century, individuals, multi-national corporations (MNCs) and Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) are now accepted as actors in international politics.³ It would not be correct to claim that international actors themselves have changed today. However, relationships between actors and intra-actor relations have become almost indistinguishable and international relations are more integrated than ever before.⁴

Integration, which was hailed at the beginning of the globalization process, has occurred significantly in economics, finance and technology as of the time of this writing, but it has not been realized at the level of institutions and ideas. Indeed, for some, the integration process has increased resistance against globalization. While the global economic “cake” has expanded, carelessness in distribution has been remarkable, triggering the reflex of nation-states to protect their sovereignty against a globally integrated world economy. International economic arrangements, which were not debated much in the early periods following the collapse of the Soviet Union, have been increasingly discussed, especially among civilians, and have even been accepted in certain political circles as the cause of many problems, from terrorism to immigration, from poverty to unemployment.⁵

Since the dissolution of the bipolar system, civil society has increasingly moved toward the center of politics in an environment of striking

inequality in global income distribution, and indeed may find itself charged with an important mission for global democracy. Even in the U.S., it is noteworthy that Democrat and Republican politicians alike have affirmed the attitudes of civil society toward state power and agree that this would enrich democracy—that civil society would succeed where politics could not. There is a large amount of data confirming that this idea is frequently discussed and accepted by American universities. Perhaps it is best illustrated by President Bill Clinton’s statement: “the era of great governments is over.”⁶

But despite civil society’s increasing importance, sovereign states have not disappeared. Moreover, they can no longer be isolated, nor can their border walls remain high. Although the international system has an anarchic appearance, the existence of a global order cannot be denied. Areas of cooperation, juxtaposed with the use of high technology in arms and the defense industry have created an environment where global harmony and conflict are intertwined.

The intertwined relations of states may be seen in every field from conflict to joint work. States no longer experience bloc-type disconnections. The fact that two states may cooperate in one field while enmeshed in conflict in another is not surprising. In such a context, it is inevitable for diplomacy to develop new methods.

The present study hypothesizes that the evolving nature of international society and its current agenda create a symbiotic environment in diplomacy, requiring the adoption of new methods and approaches in diplomacy. In the first part of the study, international society and diplomatic actors are discussed. The second part debates the diplomatic symbiosis that dominates the evolving international system. In the last part of the study, the Antalya Diplomacy Forum (ADF) is analyzed as an example of new approaches in the diplomatic, symbiotic environment.

International Society and Global World Order

In his lectures at the London School of Economics, Martin Wight places the English School on a “rationalist” or “Grotian” ground. Hugo de Grotius criticizes realists and pacifists in his study titled “De Jure Belli

ac Pacis”, claiming that the notion that everything is permissible in war, as well as the view that those who use force will never be justified are not acceptable, and instead highlights a “middle way” (*via media*) between both approaches. Thus, according to the English School, the international system is more “civilized” than realists claim. It is not possible to expect conflicts to simply disappear, as idealized by utopians. The expectations of this school have never been to achieve the level of stability of national societies in international relations. The divergence of thought between the realists and idealists, which is called the “first debate” in terms of the history of international thought, poses the concepts of a cosmopolitan administration, morality and trust against those of state-centered power, interest and security in interstate relations.⁷

International liberal and utopian politicians consider the realists pessimistic and lacking in political imagination regarding the development of a cosmopolitan morality and the creation of a global climate of peace and security. However, the strained atmosphere of the bipolar system between the two world wars and in the post-WW II period has revealed many reasons justifying the realists. According to Hedley Bull, the observations of realists about the actions of hostile parties to control and neutralize each other, at times by cheating, in an anarchic state is an irrefutable finding. However, this is not the only dimension of the essence of world politics. Although states (mostly) control war tools

Although states (mostly) control war tools and equipment, the simultaneous development of peaceful mechanisms for interaction between states and a peaceful international environment corresponding to the interests of states has created the phenomenon of “international society

and equipment, the simultaneous development of peaceful mechanisms for interaction between states and a peaceful international environment corresponding to the interests of states has created the phenomenon of “international society”.⁸

The idea of an international society presumes the existence of an international environment where common rules have developed to

a great extent. Yet a paradox is inherent in the environment itself: the powerful states of the international system will not support something

contrary to their interests as global values and rules develop, and thus, the strong ones will gain an unfair advantage over the others. Although the scholars of the English School are continuing to study options to improve the problematic areas of international society, it is not possible to claim that they do not expect a radical change in this sphere. Still, there is an expectation that a system of states interconnected with each other will expand the field of their “common interests”, which will produce common values and institutions.

Bull states that it is not necessary for states interconnected on the basis of common interest to have common civil roots; rather, states with different cultural backgrounds can be included in an equitable society in the context of “common interest”.⁹ Additionally, it can be expected that states developing common institutions and rules, and meeting in a partnership of interests will put their own interests in second place from time to time in favor of the continuation of the system. The capacity of such a system to benefit each unit depends on its “sustainability” and the “predictability” of developments within the system.¹⁰ However, since the continuation of the system and the interests of the states will overlap within the process, states will not have to manage any conflict.

With the development of international society, debates on institutions that can become partners began. For example, Bull conceives of five institutions of international (interstate) society: war, balance of power, concert of the great powers, diplomacy and international law. Barry Buzan and Cornelia Navari add the institution of sovereignty and Nicolas Terradas adds the institution of trade. As the level of adoption of these institutions by the states increases, it is possible to discuss positive development in terms of an international social order. However, these institutions may not always lead international society to balance and unity. These institutions sometimes have unifying and sometimes dividing characteristics. For example, besides the destruction of order, wars also have the feature of developing a new order and institutions.¹¹ It is not always possible for the order to be accepted and approved by each state. If the existing order is not accepted by a group of states, it will not only make the construction of international society difficult, but will hinder cooperation and common achievements. For this reason, implementable agreements with common denominators should be

sought after wars. Bull notes that states can benefit from the advantages of international society without transferring their sovereign rights to a higher authority. According to Bull, the legitimate use of force, respect for each other's borders and mutual trust (*pacta sunt servanda*) are the basic rules that are considered to be more important than the common culture and lifestyle among states.¹²

A similar approach is argued by John Rawls in his study titled, "The Law of Peoples". Rawls emphasizes that political, economic and cultural differences in the international arena are acceptable if states comply with common principles. According to Rawls, these common principles are: states' respect for each other's political sovereignty and territorial integrity, adherence to treaties and the law of war, openness to cooperation in order to reduce injustices such as poverty among states to reach a more fair socio-political global structure and avoidance of the use of force except for the purposes of self-defense and humanitarian intervention. It is claimed that all states that adhere to these principles deserve global justice and that states and different cultural structures can coexist.¹³ States and societies that agree on the minimum common principles can form a part of the international community and respect each other's differences. States cannot exist in isolation from each other within the global structure. The environment, climate change, the pandemic, international trade, terrorism, drug trafficking, migration and refugees are issues that states can only deal with effectively through cooperation and coordination. The globalization process has both accelerated the development of common institutions and required the revision of existing institutions.¹⁴

Globalization emerged as a concept expressing and affirming economic integration in the 1970s. It came to be considered an irreversible global process in the 1980s and '90s, and began to appear in politics and law. It may be argued that opinions about globalization have become more realistic since the end of the first quarter of the 2000s. Those who define globalization as a danger and those who evaluate it as an opportunity exist together. And many of those who supported nation-states' integration under the great economic umbrella of globalization in the 1980s and 90s now argue that nation-states should be stronger against international military instabilities.

A chaotic atmosphere now prevails in the international arena, where contradictions and differences continue to coexist. Maybe the most distinctive feature of the new period is disorder—the intertwining of contradictory tendencies that seem doomed to a constant consumption of energy to outdo each other. Choices and decisions about the global future must be formulated within this common environment. Perhaps the current situation can be considered a key that can turn this uncertainty into an opportunity. From now on, states will decide by reflecting their will, or play their roles passively according to the decisions of a great power—or the process will proceed entirely based on luck without any intervention. The last of these three options seems unlikely; it is obvious that even in an uncertain environment, states and alliances strive constantly to produce projects for the future.

Global problems are too complex to be controlled by hard power—arms and economy—alone. Recourse to soft power elements is seen as inevitable in most cases.

Global problems are too complex to be controlled by hard power—arms and economy—alone. Recourse to soft power elements is seen as inevitable in most cases. According to Nye, a country's soft power can come from three resources: its attractive culture to others, its political values admired by others and its foreign policies accepted as legitimate and having moral authority.¹⁵ Soft power relies on generally accepted rules and conditions. Regardless of its ideology, culture or economic structure, a state must respect the minimum common ground of the international community in order to remain a member of international society.

A state should not intervene in the sovereign rights and borders of another state. This would be a violation of international law, and would consequently reduce the effectiveness of the state's soft power. Using diplomatic methods is of crucial importance in international relations, so much so that establishing dominance with hard power will lead to the loss of soft power instruments.

Today, it is impossible to discuss a complete and perfect global structure. Although the existence of global powers is not denied, the inter-

nal dynamics of regional subsystems have an indisputable influence on global politics. In their study titled, “Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security”, Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver draw attention to the fact that regional powers were not allowed to act under the hegemonic pressure of the two superpowers during the Cold War. However, the areas of action of regional powers expanded with the end of the bipolar system.¹⁶

Global Issues and Diplomatic Symbiosis

Interaction among regional powers has gained a more important dimension that should be taken into account in the analysis of global politics. Regional states’ perception of threats from neighbors, the intra-regional securitization processes and relations between intra-regional states began to be examined from different aspects, forming the basis for the development of Regional Security Complex Theory. The concept of a regional security complex was introduced by Barry Buzan in 1983. Later it was developed as one of the security theories of the Copenhagen School in a joint study by Ole Wæver and Barry Buzan.¹⁷

To thoughtfully consider global problems and address them in any meaningful way, regional issues must be focused on. Understanding regional dynamics and cooperating with regional powers has become more important than ever before. Global powers are expected to understand the regional dimension and develop communication in this direction. However, Regional Security Complex Theory emphasizes possible disconnections in communication channels due to the “securitization” of regional states against each other. Additionally, the fact that states of the same region generally define the “other” from their immediate surroundings while constructing their national identities constitutes an important obstacle to the development of regional relations. When working to establish or manage regional relations, a government’s direct contact with such an “other” involves an effort that needs to be meticulously explained in order to be legitimized and accepted by the domestic public.

The globalization process has increased the interaction of societies with each other, and student exchanges, labor circulation and migration

have increased contact among citizens of different cultures. Between 1990 and 2008, the proportion of international migrants increased by 36%.¹⁸ While we tend to think of such contact as occurring simply between members of two different cultures, this is not always the case: interactions can occur between members of more than two communities. A person who interacts within many societies may develop a sense of multidimensional belongings. For example, a person with a Polish mother and a Turkish father who settles in England is affected by all three identities, but will not be able to fully represent all three, as he/she is a foreigner in England, an expatriate in Türkiye and a Turk in Poland. Although such multinational connections may seem like a disadvantage at first glance, multifaceted affiliations have the ability to form bridges between societies.¹⁹

The global structure, which has been called the “new world order” in the last 30 years, has not been clarified in terms of content. It has developed features close to a “universal system” or “hierarchical system”. Such structures will give

priority to the international system in decision-making processes. At the same time, states cannot ignore the requirements of their national processes. As a result, many states find themselves adopting an intertwined form of domestic and foreign policy. In fact, it has become impossible for states to deal with their domestic and foreign policies separately from each other.

The Covid-19 pandemic revealed the inevitability of international interaction and the active role of nation-states in the implementation of global decisions. Despite all the deficiencies in the management of the process, it has been observed that civil society is an important actor too.²⁰

As Edmund Burke III states, the first quarter of the 21st century witnessed important breaks and innovations in international relations and world history. These developments were to some extent intellectual revolutions with the acceptance of the global interdependence of societies. The multifaceted, multicultural and variable structure of international

The Covid-19 pandemic revealed the inevitability of international interaction and the active role of nation-states in the implementation of global decisions.

relations has emerged as a reality. In such a structure, to define diplomacy merely as “the process of transferring the thoughts of a government on certain issues to another government” places the all other factors affecting the diplomatic process in a secondary position, including global politics, civil society, internal and external shareholders, climate-related shareholders, global health policies, migration movements, historical background and the idea of global justice.

The multi-actor understanding of diplomatic activity, characteristic of the new diplomatic era, posits that foreign policy is an amorphous phenomenon, devoid of strict institutional markers. Thus, socio-cultural aspects of the activities of diplomacy in the new era are extended to include such topics as the symbolic language of diplomacy, the role of art, the daily working life of a diplomat, the informal channels of diplomacy, reflections of diplomats, etc.²¹ Levy explains this situation as a crisis of confidence in inter-state relations that makes the intensification of diplomacy one of the key factors in building bridges for the future and requires new, more effective methods of diplomacy.²² In other words, as the threats and challenges of today show, the efforts of classical diplomats are not sufficient; that is, employees of state bodies engaged in foreign relations are not enough to avoid a catastrophe. This circumstance determines and legitimizes the development of so-called public, civil, or people’s diplomacy to a certain extent. The role of participants in diplomatic processes, participants who are increasingly the subjects of international contacts, is played by new institutions consolidating the interests of various social groups: businesses, academic society, civil society organizations, religious associations and finally, private individuals. In the 21st century, it is possible to fight effectively for peace only with the whole world, that is, the whole human race.

In this sense, a wide range of protagonists are actively involved in peacekeeping activities, and any individual is not only *homo sapiens* but also *homo diplomaticus*.²³ The monopoly of the state and of specialized actors—diplomats—to formulate and lead foreign affairs has been eroded, highlighting “the increasing symbiosis between the activities of state and non-state representatives through multiple interactions taking place between the actors concerned by the foreign action of state.”²⁴

In other words, the international system is now dominated by diplomatic symbiosis. Lexically, “symbiosis” expresses any of various living arrangements between members of two different types, including mutualism, commensalism and parasitism, where both positive (beneficial) and negative (unfavorable/harmful) associations are involved. The members are identified as symbionts. Any relationship between two species populations that live together is symbiotic, whether the relationship benefits, harms or has no impact on the populations.²⁵ In other words, symbiosis is a state of relationship between two species in which each creates the required environment for the other for its continued existence.²⁶ Diplomatic symbiosis can be defined as a relationship between all shareholders, partners, actors or organizations that depend on each other equally within international society.

As mentioned above, diplomacy in the current international system experience is subject to fundamental changes at an unexpected rate.²⁷ Considering that diplomacy means to establish relations at various levels and with several actors, it is necessary to bring together the attempts of the social, private and public sectors within the evolving nature of international society. There is a close symbiosis: diplomacy between states cannot be conducted only through their respective executive departments of foreign affairs. Diplomatic symbiosis between shareholders is determinant of serving the overall national interests of states. The liberalizing and globalizing economy requires diplomatic support. So, diplomacy has to be relevant to the changing definition of national interests and priorities.

The globality of today’s problems and the necessity of seeking solutions in interconnected relations have made participatory democratic diplomatic platforms on a global scale absolutely crucial. In their 2019 study titled “Participatory Democracy”, Roussopoulos and Benello attach importance to “choosing a collective path” as the primary effort structuring the concept of “participatory democracy”. Resting their analyses on a “human” basis, they state that people desire a community where it is possible to control the decisions taken on issues concerning themselves.²⁸

The globality of today’s problems and the necessity of seeking solutions in interconnected relations have made participatory democratic diplomatic platforms on a global scale absolutely crucial.

The dominant actors of global politics no longer possess the capacity to securitize the other elements or factors of global politics for their unilateral interests. The world has perceived the importance and necessity of collective effort. Trump, for example, as a president evaluating global politics from a unilateralist perspective, grounded his politics on the motto, “America first”, reflected in his immigration and trade policies. He exhibited the same attitudes during the Covid-19 pandemic and attempted to manage the process of addressing the crisis unilaterally instead of through global coordination. In other words, Trump tried to solve a global problem with a nationalist attitude, nicknaming Covid the “Chinese Virus”.²⁹ This approach did garner reactions in both foreign policy and domestic policy; many criticized Trump for failing in the fight against Covid-19 and for his uncooperative position.³⁰

Granted, societies sometimes prefer security in the “security-freedom” dilemma,³¹ which may give rise to nationalist impulses. Yet security can also be gained by expanding community. Societies’ attention to global problems increases due to the role of developing communication networks and civil society organizations. It may be argued that the rate of governments’ involvement in cooperation on global problems affects the rate of domestic support more than in previous eras. Due to the intertwining of domestic and global issues, it is not possible to understand diplomatic interactions between states only on a bilateral level. Moreover, the number of issues that concern only two states is gradually decreasing. Almost all problems have a global dimension. The dependency of states in global politics, their attempts to survive and their integration with each other form a complete “symbiotic” relationship model. Such an intricate style of global politics has made the development of new methods in diplomatic relations inevitable.

Diplomacy in a Symbiotic Atmosphere: the Antalya Diplomacy Forum

As mentioned above, the need for diplomacy is greater than ever before across a broad spectrum of global and regional concerns; the pains of reshaping the global economy and conducting international politics are increasing, and regional and global tensions are escalating.³²

In this new era of an evolving international order, more innovative methods, and regional and global initiatives are observed in Turkish foreign policy. Diplomatic practices such as education diplomacy, sports diplomacy, science diplomacy, public diplomacy and trilateral cooperation mechanisms aim to serve Türkiye's role as a game-maker on a regional and global scale. In this context, the ADF deserves particular attention.

Encyclopedia Britannica defines 'forum' in its origin as a place: "in Roman cities in antiquity, a multipurpose, centrally located open area that was surrounded by public buildings and colonnades and that served as a public gathering place. It was an orderly spatial adaptation of the Greek agora, or marketplace, and acropolis."³³ The forum was the place in ancient Rome and other cities where people gathered to talk about public affairs and take decisions on the main issues affecting the populace. Public issues were discussed there with the broad participation of all relevant parties.

Today a large number of interested parties can take part in the diplomatic process in addition to official diplomats. In fact, it has been observed in recent years that politicians generally appear in diplomatic negotiations rather than diplomats. As emphasized above, both the field of diplomacy and the partners of diplomatic processes have expanded with increases in digitalized technology.³⁴ Recent developments in international relations have triggered the revival of the "forum" style meetings observed in ancient Rome with a contemporary interpretation, allowing the various parties to come together. Since these meetings are not bilateral, the participation of parties in conflict at the same platform is not considered strange, and domestic political reaction is minimal. Indeed, it is easier for parties for whom it is difficult to establish bilateral contacts to meet in a forum. Such parties are often able to find opportunities to negotiate there.

Recent developments in international relations have triggered the revival of the "forum" style meetings observed in ancient Rome with a contemporary interpretation, allowing the various parties to come together.

The determination of the right location for forum diplomacy is vital, as it needs to be at a central point of global politics, at a reasonable distance from most of the participants in terms of transportation, and security must be considered. Climate, time zone and topographic suitability can be added to these criteria. The number and quality of participants are factors that directly affect the success of the forum.

The ADF can be considered as the application of an old method of diplomacy in a new format. Antalya, on Türkiye's southern Mediterranean coast, is one of the leading tourism centers in the world. The region's suitable location in terms of transportation is in perfect harmony with its climate, which makes the tourism sector active in all seasons. Most importantly, the ancient city of Patara, which served as the capital of the Lycian League, one of the oldest republics in history, is located within the provincial borders of Antalya. It would be appropriate to remember Montesquieu de L'Esprit des Lois's statement in 1748: "If I had to give a perfect example of a confederation republic, I would show Lycia. It would be correct to call this parliament building, Lycian Union Parliament Building."³⁵

Similarly, an article in the *New York Times* titled, "Patara Journal; A Congress, Buried in the Sand, Inspired One on a Hill", recalls that the administrative structure of the Lycians, which was established in Patara and hosted the oldest parliament building in the world 3,000 years ago, formed the basis of the U.S. federative system. The newspaper drew attention to the fact that the Lycian League, which consisted of 23 cities connected to a central administration with a federative structure, was one of the rare examples of representative democracy in ancient times and that a similar model was observed in the U.S. federative system.³⁶ Because of its rich history and present-day amenities, Antalya was a right choice for the ADF forum location. Its founders aim to institutionalize the ADF as a global platform brand that brings together official and non-governmental actors to discuss global and regional issues.

Organized under the auspices of the President of the Republic of Türkiye, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, and hosted by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, H.E. Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu, the first forum was held on June 18–20, 2021 at the NEST Congress Center in Antalya. The first Forum explored the horizons of diplomacy across a range of key regional, glob-

al and thematic issues under the theme, “Innovative Diplomacy: New Era, New Approaches”. In his inauguration speech, Foreign Minister Çavuşoğlu emphasized the importance of Antalya: “We organized the Antalya Diplomacy Forum in this city, which was home to Patara, the first parliament of the world, where the tradition of seeking solutions to problems by talking and negotiating began.”³⁷ Underlining the benefits of international cooperation, Minister Çavuşoğlu stressed that no solitary country can find solutions to the problems facing humanity without acting together.³⁸ Eleven Heads of State and government, 45 Ministers of Foreign Affairs and minister-level representatives attended the Forum; this meant that one out of every five Ministers of Foreign Affairs in the world participated in the ADF.³⁹ Additionally, three former heads of state and government, approximately 52 representatives of international organizations, former government officials, representatives of the business world, opinion leaders and academicians, media representatives, youth organizations and university students attended the ADF. In addition to two sessions of “Global Governance: New Approaches for Global Solutions” and “How Can We Strengthen Regional Solidarity in View of Lessons Learned?” attended by leaders, several sessions, panels and talks were held at the ADF on regional, global and thematic topics (see Table 1).⁴⁰

Table 1. The ADF 2021

Panels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -A New Era in Transatlantic Relations -Partnership with Africa: Mutual Gains -Infodemic and Fake News in the Virtual World -Southern Caucasus: New Opportunities for Regional Peace and Cooperation -Innovative Mediation Regional Cooperation in Asia -Humanitarian Approach towards Refugees and Migrants -The Middle East and North Africa: Towards a Sustainable Agenda -Women's Contribution to the Search for Peace -Tackling Extremism and Discrimination -A Regional Conference for Eastern Mediterranean -The Business Sector and Economic Diplomacy -Terrorism Threat Transforming -Energy: What Future Awaits Us? -Neighbors SEE Together: Future of Europe -How to Increase the Effectiveness of Regional Organizations? -Youth Forum
#ADFTalks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Innovative Mediation -The Way Forward for a Realistic Settlement in Cyprus -Iran's Neighborhood Doctrine
#ADFRound	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The Increasing Importance of Parliamentary Diplomacy -From Theory to Practice: Innovative Ways for a more Effective Diplomacy
#ADFRound/ SideEvent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Türkiye-Africa Opportunities for Cooperation -A New Diplomacy for A New World
#ADFYouth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Night Talks

The Forum brought in innovations in line with its main theme, including a “Diplomacy Tunnel” from Kadesh to the present, and a digital exhibition organized with photos by world-renowned photographer Ara Güler and painter Osman Hamdi.⁴¹

The second Forum was held on March 11–13, 2022. Participants addressed a wide range of topics in international relations under the overarching theme, “Recoding Diplomacy”. 17 Heads of State and Government, 80 Ministers and 39 international organization representatives attended the second ADF. Three leaders’ sessions on “Price of Peace or Cost of War”, “Regional and Global Pathways to Peace and Prosperity” and “Representing Change”, as well as 27 panels, four interviews, three roundtable meetings and three side events were organized throughout the Forum (see Table 2);⁴² 212 bilateral meetings were held between the participating delegations.

Table 2. The ADF 2022

Panels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthening solidarity and promoting peace through soft power - Afghanistan: How to cope with new realities? - A vision for development in Africa - Cooperation and competition in the Asia-Pacific - Searching for a common ground in the Middle East - Climate change and energy transition - Energy security in turmoil - A green economy for an inclusive and sustainable growth - Combating disinformation in the Post-Truth age - AI, Metaverse and all else - What does strategic autonomy entail for Europe? - Peaceful resolution of maritime boundary disputes - Addressing irregular migration: A holistic approach - Countering terrorism: What is missing? - Revitalizing multilateralism: UN and beyond - Women empower humanity - Fighting racism and discrimination - Democratic governance and security - Reconciliatory dialogue in the Balkans - Post-pandemic recovery, livelihoods and localities - Effective global governance - Prospects for an inclusive peace in the South Caucasus - Re-energizing the dynamism in Latin America and the Caribbean - Food security & Transforming agriculture - Equity in global health - Preserving cultural heritage in a digital age - Justice, reforms and stronger institutions
#ADFTalks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bridging diversity - Europe's neighbors, Europe as a neighbor - Multilateralism for Peace and Stability - The future of Bosnia and Herzegovina - Cyprus settlement: Reaffirming inherent rights
#ADFRound	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Asia Anew: For a sustained regional growth - Recording diplomacy
#ADFRound/SideEvent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parliamentary diplomacy
#ADFYouth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sports

The ADF is designed as a dialogue platform that enables leaders, politicians, academicians, opinion leaders, diplomats, businesspeople, youth and the media sector to come together every year to address global and regional issues with a visionary perspective and offer solutions to contemporary problems. The Forum seeks to contribute to the formation of new ideas and trends regarding the future of the region and the world, and to shape the global agenda and discourse. Different but complementary views are brought together in the panels, and tested through interactions with the audience. The participation of young

The ADF is designed as a dialogue platform that enables leaders, politicians, academicians, opinion leaders, diplomats, business-people, youth and the media sector to come together every year to address global and regional issues with a visionary perspective and offer solutions to contemporary problems.

people and students in the ADF is notable in the context of sharing experience and constructing the future. More than 2,000 participants attended the first Forum and more than 3,000 the second, from different sectors involved in diplomatic processes in some way. The successful use of digital innovations in events, the up-to-datedness of the ADF's social media accounts and the number of followers are significant features for

its transformation into a global brand in the category of an informal diplomatic platform and a respected think-tank. The casual dress code of the forum aimed to provide solutions to the problems of the participants in a comfortable, stress-free environment in the best holiday spots of Antalya.

The ADF continues its activities in the digital environment as #ADFTalks, #ADF120Sec, #ADFOpinion and #ADFVisitorsCorner throughout the year. On these platforms, the ADF hosts virtual events, attended by distinguished speakers that address global and regional issues in collaboration with leading international think-tanks. These features make the ADF unique among its peers.

Conclusion

Diplomacy as a foreign policy tool has evolved in parallel with the transformation of the global system throughout the ages. Recently, the globalization process has caused international relations to gain new features and involve new actors and shareholders beyond those of the previous periods. Technological innovations, the intertwining of commercial and economic relations and the transparency of today's borders increase human mobility and expand states' classical sovereignty areas. These changes, which entail shifts in the relationship between state and individual, require attention.

Today, there is a lack of decisive central authority in international politics. Regional security complexes must be considered in order to understand the international system as a significant phenomenon that reveals the importance of the nation-state structure. To manage such a structure requires states to develop common denominators among themselves. Thus, states have found ways to cooperate in many areas, even while some of their old conflict issues remain unresolved. To fail to do so would risk being excluded from the global community.

Participation in the global community is of the essence in areas that require global efforts, such as the pandemic, migration, drug trafficking and terrorism. In the present global political atmosphere, not only states but all stakeholders play important roles; states are seeking cooperation opportunities in such a symbiotic environment. Thus, the practice of diplomacy, including its language and methods, is transforming due to new fluctuations in global politics compounded by the Covid-19 pandemic. Individuals, societies and states need robust diplomacy to resolve conflicts, manage crises, ease adaptation to changes and encourage cooperation and partnerships. To this end, diplomacy needs innovative, efficient and effective methods with renewed language and unconventional digital capabilities. It must be rapidly responsive, attentive and adaptive to the demands of the day. Forum diplomacy provides an ideal opportunity for diplomatic contacts in this sense. It provides a platform where even parties in conflict, who cannot come into contact on bilateral ground, can come together peacefully. Fora offer crucial opportunities for parties whose bilateral diplomatic dialogue channels have been broken.

In this context, the ADF was established as a platform where various experts, stakeholders and decisionmakers address important global and regional challenges and exchange intellectual ideas. Aiming to create a conciliatory dialogue environment where opposing views can be aired and discussed productively, the ADF actively served to support peace and diplomacy by hosting the first high-level contact between the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Russia and Ukraine. The ADF forms a roof under which everyone who seeks creative solutions to global issues can take part, offering a new environment and a new diplomatic, symbiotic atmosphere as an effective foreign policy instrument of the future.

Endnotes

- 1 Barış Özdal & Kutay R. Karaca, *Diplomasi Tarihi-I*, Bursa: Dora, 2015, p. 27.
- 2 Andrew Heywood, *Küresel Siyaset*, Ankara: Adres, 2013, p. 27.
- 3 Faruk Sönmezoğlu, *Uluslararası Politika ve Dış Politika Analizi*, İstanbul: Der, 2019, pp. 70–80.
- 4 Heywood, *Küresel Siyaset*, p. 27.
- 5 Stephen D. King, *Küreselleşmenin Sonu Kasvetli Yeni Dünya*, İstanbul: Profilkitap, 2019, p. 232.
- 6 John Ehrenberg, *Sivil Toplum: Bir Fikrin Eleştirel Tarihi*, İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi, 2022, p. 15.
- 7 Andrew Linklater, “İngiliz Okulu,” Scott Burchill et al. (eds.), *Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri*, İstanbul: Küre, 2012, pp. 120–121.
- 8 Ibid, p. 123.
- 9 Ibid, p. 127.
- 10 Onur Erpul, “İngiliz Okulu Kuramı ve Uluslararası Toplumda Güvenlik,” Başar Baysal (ed.), *Uluslararası İlişkilerde Güvenlik*, İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2022, p. 36.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Linklater, “İngiliz Okulu,” pp. 127–128.
- 13 Terry Nardin, “Uluslararası Siyaset Teorisi,” Scott Burchill et al. (eds.), *Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri*, İstanbul: Küre, 2012, pp. 385–386.
- 14 Ahmet E. Tonak, *Küreselleşme*, Ankara: İmge, 2004, p. 14.
- 15 Joseph S. Nye, *Yumuşak Güç*, Ankara: Elips, 2005, p. 20.
- 16 Barry Buzan & Ole Wæver, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. 10–13.
- 17 Rüştü Kaya, “Orta Asya ‘Bölgesel Güvenlik Kompleksi’ ve Şangay İşbirliği Örgütü,” *Uluslararası Siyaset Bilimi ve Kentsel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Vol. 7, Special Issue (2019), p. 55.
- 18 George Ritzer, *Küresel Dünya*, İstanbul: Ayrıntı, 2020, p. 314.
- 19 Doğu Şimşek, *Uluslararası Kimlikler*, İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2016, p. 2.
- 20 Çağatay Demirel, “Pandemi Döneminde Sivil Toplum Kuruluşlarında İletişim ve Halkla İlişkiler; TTB’nin Twitter Hesabına Yönelik Bir İçerik Analizi,” *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (2022) pp. 304–325.
- 21 Dmitry Valeryevich Mazarchuk, “‘New Diplomatic History’: Formation, Directions of Research and Development Prospects (in Russian),” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus – Humanitarian Science Series*, Vol. 66, No. 3 (2021), p. 287.
- 22 Dmitry Andreevich Levy, “‘Celebrity Diplomacy’: New Methods of Diplomacy or Pseudo-Tools? (in Russian),” *Azimuth of Scientific Research: Economics and Management*, Vol. 7, No. 3–24 (2018), p. 363.
- 23 Roman O. Reinhardt, “New Forms and Methods of Diplomacy,” *Journal of International Analytics*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (2020), pp. 11–20.
- 24 Guillaume Devin & Marie Toernquist-Chesnier, “Burst Diplomacy: The Diplomacies of Foreign Policy: Actors and Methods,” *Brazilian Political Science Review*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (2010), pp. 60–77.
- 25 For details about the theory of symbiosis, see “Lynn Margulis,” *Encyclopedia Britannica*, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Lynn-Margulis>.
- 26 For the meaning of symbiosis in English, see <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/symbiosis>.
- 27 Volker Stanzel (ed.), “New Realities in Foreign Affairs: Diplomacy in the 21st Century,” *SWP Research Paper*, 2018, p. 1, <https://www.swp-berlin.org/en/publication/new-realities-in-foreign-affairs-diplomacy-in-the-21st-century>.
- 28 Dimitrios Roussopoulos & George C. Benelle, *Katılımcı Demokrasi*, İstanbul: Sümer, 2019, p. 15.

- 29 Selçuk Önder, "Donald Trump'ın Küresel Siyaset ve Dış Politika Anlayışının Covid-19 Pandemi Sürecine Yansımaları," *Journal of Political Administrative and Local Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (2022) pp. 66–80.
- 30 "ABD'de Trump Yönetimi Covid-19 Salgınıyla Mücadelede Sınıfta Kaldı," *Anadolu Ajansı*, January 5, 2021, <https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/dunya/abd-de-trump-yonetimi-kovid-19-salginiyla-mucadelede-sinifta-kaldi/2098567>.
- 31 Başar Baysal & Berk Esen, "Demokrasi ve Güvenlik," Başar Baysal (ed.), *Uluslararası İlişkilerde Güvenlik*, İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi, 2022, p. 297.
- 32 Kerem Alkin, "Küresel Marka: Antalya Diplomasi Forumu," *Sabah*, March 14, 2022, <https://www.sabah.com.tr/yazarlar/kerem-alkin/2022/03/14/kuresel-marka-antalya-diplomasi-forumu>.
- 33 "Garden City Urban Planning," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/garden-city-urban-planning>.
- 34 Emine Kaplan, "Politik Psikoloji Bağlamında Diplomaside Dijital Dönüşüm: Antalya Diplomasi Forumu," *Cyberpolitik Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 11 (2021), p. 23.
- 35 Erwin H. Price, "Montesquieu's 'Spirit of the Laws,'" *The Mississippi Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (1953), pp. 50–61.
- 36 Richard Bernstein, "Patara Journal; A Congress, Buried in the Sand, Inspired One on a Hill," *The New York Times*, September 19, 2005, <https://www.nytimes.com/2005/09/19/world/europe/patara-journal-a-congress-buried-in-the-sand-inspired-one-on-a.html>.
- 37 "Antalya Diplomacy Forum 2021," *Ministry of Foreign Affairs*, <https://www.mfa.gov.tr/antalya-diplomasi-forumu-18-20-haziran-2021.en.mfa>.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 For details, see <https://antalyadf.org/en/adf-2021-3>.
- 41 "Antalya Diplomacy Forum 2021."
- 42 Ibid.