AN ANALYSIS OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE UNION OF TURKISH WORLD MUNICIPALITIES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF PARADIPLOMACY[1]

TÜRK DÜNYASI BELEDİYELER BİRLİĞİ FAALİYETLERİNİN PARADİPLOMASİ AÇISINDAN İNCELENMESİ

Uğur ÜNAL[2]

ABSTRACT

In an era of increasingly interconnected international relations, many of the challenges confronting societies today have become global in nature, demanding collective solutions. Environmental and climate issues, once confined to national and local contexts, have now surfaced on a global scale. This shift has prompted local actors to adapt their policies and take on more proactive roles.

Consequently, the diplomatic functions of local actors have driven changes in global decision-making and necessitated a reassessment of established paradigms, giving rise to the concept of 'paradiplomacy.' Paradiplomacy, spurred by transformations in international relations, has expanded the traditional scope of diplomacy, empowering local actors to play a prominent role and exert influence on global matters.

This study examines the paradiplomacy activities of the Union of Turkish World Municipalities (TDBB), a subnational entity representing the Turkic World, within a

qualitative research framework. The aim is to highlight TDBB's contributions to the development of the Turkic World through the lens of paradiplomacy and to propose strategies for more effective engagement in this field.

Keywords: Diplomacy, Public diplomacy, Paradiplomacy, Local Governments, Union of Turkish World Municipalities

ÖZET

Ülkelerarası ilişkilerin daha da güçlendiği bugünün dünyasında, toplumlarımızın yüzleşmek durumunda kaldığı birçok sorun, global ölçekte hissedilen ve çare gerektiren olgular olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Ulusal ve yerel alandaki çevre ve iklim sorunları küresel düzeyde kendini gösterir olmuş ve bu durumlar, yerel aktörlerin uyguladığı politikalarda, değişime ve etkin olarak bir rol üstlenmesine neden olmuştur.

Bu bağlamda, yerel aktörlerin diplomasi içerisindeki fonksiyonları, küresel düzeyde uluslararası politikalarda alınan kararların değişimini zorunlu hale getirmiş, varsayılan paradigmaların tekrardan gözden geçirilmesini gerektirmiş ve ihtiyaç 'paradiplomasi'yi ortaya çıkarmıştır. Paradiplomasi, uluslararası ilişkilerdeki değişimler sonucu diplomasi kavramının kabının dışına çıkmasını zorlayarak yerel aktörlerin ön plana çıkmasını ve küresel düzeyde söz sahibi olmasını sağlamıştır.

Bu çalışmada, Ulus altı aktör olarak Türk Dünyası adına etkin çalışmalar yürütmekte olan Türk Dünyası Belediyeler Birliği (TDBB)'nin son yıllarda gerçekleştirdiği paradiplomasi faaliyetleri, niteliksel araştırma paradigması çerçevesinde incelenmektedir. Çalışmada Paradiplomasi perspektifinde TDBB'nin Türk Dünyasının kalkınmasına katkılarının ortaya konması ve paradiplomasi alanının daha aktif kullanılabilmesi konusunda öneriler sunulması hedeflenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Diplomasi, Kamu diplomasisi, Paradiplomasi, Yerel Yönetimler, Türk Dünyası Belediyeler Birliği*

INTRODUCTION

States choose the most appropriate instruments to achieve their ambitions and objectives in light of the international environment. These instruments are diplomacy, economic policies, psychological techniques, intervention in internal affairs, and methods based on military power.[3] Diplomacy is acknowledged as an instrument of political influence among the various foreign policy instruments employed by states.[4] "Diplomacy should not be viewed as the policy itself; rather, it serves as the mechanism through which policy is enacted. These two elements are mutually reinforcing, with the functioning of one being contingent upon the other. Furthermore, diplomacy lacks a standalone role separate from foreign policy; collectively, they create an integrated approach. While policy establishes the overarching strategy, diplomacy delineates and executes the specific tactics".[5]

Nicolson argues that foreign policy stems from the general perception of national needs, shaped by the primordial instinct for survival as well as by the fluctuating forces of economic and strategic interest and the prevailing public opinion. On the contrary, diplomacy is to be understood not as an end; it is an instrumental method-an operational method but not a result. It is the art of fulfillment of foreign policy goals with the help of negotiation without using violence.[6] The general consensus in international relations is that there are two methods for resolving international disputes and conflicts: war and diplomacy. While resolving conflicts and disputes through force is called war, solving them through peaceful means is called diplomacy.[7]

The concept of diplomacy, as perceived and practiced in current times, was for the first time proposed by Edmund Burke in 1796. Charles de Martens described it further in 1827 as a "science which governs the relations of independent states with each other, negotiating being an art." G. In his 1883 book, Traite Complet de Diplomatie, De Garden described the discipline of diplomacy as one concerned with mutual dependence and interests among nations. He expressed it as the art of harmonizing international interests and also as the science and practice of conducting negotiations. The concept of diplomacy carries with it the structure through which peace, security, stability, and respect can be maintained in the relations between states. A. Rivier, in his work Droit des Gens (1896), described diplomacy as the science and art of representing governments and conducting negotiations between states, encompassing the entire representation system, including foreign ministries and diplomatic agents[8]

---

3   Mehmet, Gönlübol, "*Uluslararası Politika: İlkeler, Kavramlar, Kurumlar*", Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 2000, s.111.

4   Faruk, Sönmezoğlu, *"Uluslararası İlişkilere Giriş"*, İstanbul. Der Yay., 2005, s. 289.

5   Temel, İskit, "*Diplomasi: Tarihi, Teorisi, Kurumları ve Uygulaması*", İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları. 4. Baskı., 2007, s. 2.

6   İskit, "*Diplomasi: Tarihi…,*" s. 49.

7   Hüner, Tuncer, "*Eski ve Yeni Diplomasi*", Ankara. Ümit Yayıncılık, 2009, s. 5.

8   Refet, Yinanç, "*Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Dış Politika Anlayışı ve Uygulamaları*", Türk Dış Politikası 1919-2008, Ankara, Platin Yayınları, 2008, s. 23.

Diplomacy, characterized as the method through which governmental entities explicitly communicate their strategies to the representatives of other governments[9], is closely linked to discourse and negotiation. Therefore, it functions not only as an instrument of the state but also as a crucial institution within the framework of the state system[10]. As Daver expressed, diplomacy is "the conduct of relations between states and governments by specially trained personnel organized hierarchically foreign service officers"[11]. Harold Nicolson defined diplomacy narrowly as the process of communication and negotiation conducted by diplomats, the official representatives of governments. Broadly, he described it as the various political influence methods and techniques a country employs in its foreign policy[12].

For the writers of classical diplomacy, it was the primary institution regulating international relations[13]. Hans Morgenthau, an important author of the realist approach to international politics, argued that diplomacy carries out four basic functions, which represent its all dimensions. The foregoing elements therefore comprise: acting upon the potential power that could be availed to meet the goals and purposes, appreciating the sources of power that other countries may have to achieve their aspirations, understanding the ways in which those different goals and objectives may cross, and adopting appropriate strategies and methods to achieve one's own goals and objectives. Morgenthau argued that failure of anyone of these tasks would put a state inept on foreign policy threatening world peace as denoted by Hall (2010).

It is now widely accepted that 'even the most powerful actors cannot achieve their objectives solely with hard power, and that well executed diplomacy can substantially enhance an actor's power[14]'. What is striking is the similarity of this definition of diplomacy to the 18th/19th century definitions, it being during this period that diplomatic institutionalization began. In this context, the concept is negotiation, dialogue, and reconciliation against conflict and war. Daver further emphasized that some authors define diplomacy as the art of negotiation in foreign relations[15]. The characteristic features of modern diplomacy are to establish mutual relations, negotiation, and representation.

Looking at its historical development, diplomacy has emerged in Northern Italy and advanced with contacts between various small city-states from the 12th

---

9   Vedat, Demir, "*Kamu Diplomasisi ve Yumuşak Güç*", İstanbul. Beta Yayınları, 2012, s. 7.

10 Gönlübol, *Uluslararası Politika: İlkeler, kavramlar….*, s.112.

11 Graham Evans - Jeffrey Newnham, "*Uluslararası İlişkiler Sözlüğü*", (Çev. H. Ahsen Utku), İstanbul: Gökkubbe, 2007, s. 167.

12 Bülent, Daver, "*Siyaset ve Rejimler*", Ankara. Doğan Yayınevi, 1969, s. 74.

13 Sönmezoğlu, "*Uluslararası İlişkilere Giriş…*", s. 323.

14 Ashvin, Gonesh, - Jan, Melissen, "*Public diplomacy: improving practice*", Netherlands institute of international relations. Clingendael, 2005, s. 3.

15 İskit, "*Diplomasi: Tarihi…*," s. 12.

century onward[16]. The principles that formed a clear and regular pattern of diplomacy gradually took shape from the 15th to the 20th century[17]. During these previous centuries, diplomacy was viewed as a means used to achieve short-term objectives. To begin with, diplomats were selected from among the aristocracy; however, in due course they came to be regarded as being prepared to use any methods whatsoever, including deceit and trickery, in order to achieve their aims[18]. As already mentioned, the pattern of diplomacy during this period was marked by its "ad hoc" nature. The distinguishing characteristic of this feature was unilateral and temporary, the diplomats that were being sent abroad for carrying out certain tasks and functions returned to their home countries once the assignments were over[19]

Diplomacy, which is based on the principle of equality, was invented in Europe when permanent representatives were exchanged as hostages in 1455 to avoid wars between the Italian city-states[20]. According to renowned diplomacy scholar Harold Nicolson, "It was then that the Duke of Milan had sent the very first permanent representative to Genoa". These diplomatic representatives were not appointed as ambassadors but rather as "resident orators." This terminology was utilized because their greatest talents were in the area of speaking on behalf of, and to, their nation's interests and convincing their counterparts accordingly. Therefore, a strong linkage between diplomacy and rhetoric has often existed. The resident diplomatic mission concept, first used in Renaissance Italy, soon spread throughout other countries in Europe. The first permanent ambassadors sent to France were from Venice and Milan. The competitive and often bellicose Italian city-states kept informed of the others' plans and policies by establishing permanent embassies in order to modify their policies accordingly[21].

Starting with the 15th century, diplomacy became organized and articulated as a system designed to maintain durable relations between separate entities and so constituted a major force in the emergence of the state system in Europe. Whereas many conflicts broke the links of these relationships, diplomacy remained an important means through which communications and negotiations could take place. The scrutiny of the general structure of diplomacy in the 15th century brings out the fact that there was a decided lack of mutual trust and this was essentially due to the fragile and volatile nature of the Italian city-states. The distinguishing aspect of this period was that the Venetians laid down basic diplomatic norms and matters relating to protocol became highly prevalent. Moreover, face-to-face encounters among sovereign leaders, referred to as summit diplomacy, began to rise in frequency

....

16 Daver, *Siyaset*…, s. 75

17 Gönlübol, "*Uluslararası politika: İlkeler, kavramlar*….," s.114.

18 Evans, "*Uluslararası İlişkiler*…," s. 165.

19 Yinanç, "*Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun*…," s. 23.

20 Tuncer, "*Eski ve Yeni Diplomasi*...," s. 20.

21 Gönlübol, "*Uluslararası Politika: İlkeler, Kavramlar*….," s.114.

concurrent with the founding of enduring diplomatic missions[22]. The paramount contribution of diplomacy to the evolution of international relations was its function as an instrument that established, refreshed, and sustained the protocols and regulations governing the international system, thereby ensuring the functionality of international organizations[23].

During the 15th and 16th centuries, the Italian city-states were at the forefront of diplomatic strategies and practices, whereas in the 17th and 18th centuries, the French emerged as pivotal in molding the landscape of diplomacy. In fact, the diplomatic methodology prevalent in Europe prior to the French Revolution of 1789 was largely reflective of French diplomatic conventions[24]. A defining characteristic of this era was the advent of a multilateral diplomatic strategy among nations[25]. Subsequently, the period marked the commencement of congresses aimed at addressing interstate conflicts. From the Congress of Vienna in 1815 until the onset of World War I, Europe established itself as the focal point of diplomacy, with convenings and deliberations in various European capitals tackling issues that extended beyond the continent[26]. Between 1618 and 1648, the Thirty Years' War saw the Congress of Westphalia bring together envoys of Protestant and Catholic states from the whole of Europe as a peace congress at which common concerns of Europe were discussed[27].

The French style significantly impacted diplomatic practices, leading to a pronounced emphasis on diplomatic demeanor and granting ambassadors the autonomy to select their own personnel. Key attributes anticipated of diplomats included extensive familiarity with the nations to which they were deployed, proficiency in fostering trust within those nations, the maintenance of amicable relations with fellow diplomats, along with personal characteristics such as patience, tranquility, and steadiness[28].

In the early 19th century, European diplomats primarily served several key functions, which encompassed facilitating bilateral communication within the nation of their assignment, making decisions on behalf of the country they represented during diplomatic negotiations, safeguarding their nation's interests[29], and collecting extensive information regarding the host country[30]. Diplomacy has in the renaissance period been practiced as a well-organized and highly professional field of operation with the primary purpose of intelligence gathering, policy and trend analysis, protection of military and political interests, and trade relations[31].

---

22 Tuncer, "*Eski ve Yeni…*," s. 36.

23 Tuncer, "*Eski ve Yeni…*," s. 37-42.

24 Evans, "*Uluslararası İlişkiler…*," s. 161.

25 Tuncer, "*Eski ve Yeni…*," s. 54.

26 a.k., s. 54-55.

27 Sönmezoğlu, *Uluslararası İlişkilere Giriş…* s. 290.

28 Tuncer, "*Eski ve Yeni…*," s. 123.

29 a.k., s. 59.

30 Sönmezoğlu, *"Uluslararası İlişkilere Giriş…*," s. 291.

31 Tuncer, "*Eski ve Yeni…*," s. 63.

The period of the First World War marked the turning point from traditional, backdoor, or old diplomacy to a new understanding of diplomacy. These elements that gave rise to the new era include changes in the pattern of power structure in international politics, the shift of international hegemony from Europe to the United States of America and the introduction of "open diplomacy" principle by the then-government in the U.S.A. President Wilson, the advancement of communication technologies, the ease of access to political procedures, the changing nature of war, and the emergence of new international norms and values[32]. The principle of "open diplomacy," coined by Woodrow Wilson, meant that the governments should not conclude or implement any secret treaty without the knowledge and approval of the public. The emerging international framework was no longer anchored on power dynamics; rather, it was based on the logic of ethnic self-determination wherein state security would no longer depend on military pacts but on a collective security arrangement. More than that, diplomatic practices had been changed from being done in secrecy by skilled individuals to being based on publicized agreements[33].

The major characteristics of this new period could be summarized as follows:[34]

• Diplomacy could no longer be solely left to the diplomats, as it increasingly became a domain of the politicians and political leadership.

• At the same time, the growing importance of public opinion made propaganda and public relations essential activities for diplomats to undertake in the countries where they were stationed.

• Where the development of communication technology brought the international media system, and since media is instrumental in public opinion shaping, it became necessary for diplomats to establish close relations with the press of their host country. The purpose of diplomats through the media was both to inform the public and monitor the current agenda.

• As economic and social factors have become more significant in international relations, foreign policy did not limit itself to the maintenance of peace and security but strove also to attain national and international prosperity, reached certain economic and social objectives, and then maintained world peace. Work in this direction and searching for ways of cooperation are among the main tasks of a modern diplomat and government.

• There appeared new actors other than government, such as supranational organizations, institutions, non-government organizations, individuals, and citizens. They also started to influence the decision-making processes in international relations.

32 a.k., s. 77.

33 a.k., s. 90.

34 a.k., s. 67-71.

As economic and social inequality mounted in the context of international relations, the leading foreign policy priorities of countries have shifted from military security to economic security. In this newly developing world system, the processing, transmission, and access to information have also started to accelerate, while the costs have been declining, thus making technology more accessible. The availability of 24/7 radio and TV programs, the prevalence of global news media, and the spread of the internet and smartphones became the defining features and drivers of 21st-century foreign policy[35]. These developments have transformed the tools and methods of classical diplomacy, shaping what is now referred to as modern diplomacy[36].

In this new era, influenced by communication technologies, the understanding of diplomacy has shifted, with new actors playing significant roles in international relations[37]. The expansion of modern diplomacy in its scope, the increase of its functions, the engagement of non-state actors in the structure of international relations, the emergence of individual diplomacy, the evolution from bilateral to multilateral contact, the increased resort to specialists in the profession, the rapid growth of international agreements, and the effect of media and mass communication upon the agenda of diplomacy have given a different emphasis to the concept. Nevertheless, these changes have not affected its crucial roles of existence - that is the relational and negotiating roles (Tiedeman 2005).

With the advent of "new diplomacy" in the contemporary epoch, there has emerged an international environment marked by various actors and issues. While nation-states remain bound by their founding principles, they have increasingly begun to seek solutions through this new form of diplomacy in attempting to address various economic, social, and security-related problems facing humanity, problems which can only be reasonably resolved through cooperative international interactions[38]. Tuncer claims that diplomacy, whether traditional or modern, has always been the most important tool of foreign policy that nations throughout history have used to promote and maintain peace and order in international relations[39].

While the international system passed through a period of interdependence of the actors, states, once perceived as the only sovereign domestic and international actor, has emerged as one among many actors in the making and implementation of policies jointly with others on the international stage. In effect, the results of political decision-making and implementation processes have turned out to be concrete both domestically and internationally. The complex and multifaceted nature of foreign policy and international relations has amplified the significance of both domestic and

---

35 Peterson, Peter, "*Public Diplomacy and the War on Terrorism*". Foreign Affairs. Vol. 81. No: 5. 2008, s. 78.

36 Tuncer, "*Eski ve Yeni…*," s. 98.

37 a.k., s. 98.

38 Evans, "*Uluslararası İlişkiler…*," s. 161.

39 Tuncer, "*Eski ve Yeni…*," s. 98-99.

international audiences. This evolving paradigm has illuminated the interrelationship between traditional diplomacy and public diplomacy, establishing public diplomacy practices and initiatives as a crucial necessity for nations (Foust 2006).

Although this traditional or war-time diplomacy has changed, it has now been replaced by many forms of diplomacy through which states engage with each other on a variety of topics including health diplomacy, sports diplomacy, education diplomacy, gastro diplomacy, art diplomacy, cultural diplomacy, and digital diplomacy are among the many. İnan argues that it is possible to bring these diverse forms together under the concept of public diplomacy in current contexts[40].

1. THE NEW DOMAIN OF DIPLOMACY: PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Diplomacy has traditionally been characterized as the practice of engaging in negotiations between nations[41]. Within the realm of international relations, it is perceived as a discipline that investigates the relationships and reciprocal impacts among global entities and communities[42]. However, it is apparent from the current context shaped by changing international relations and diplomatic practices that the concept of "diplomacy" has acquired a wider meaning in international relations beyond its earlier, narrower significance in foreign policy. The widening scope has consequently made public diplomacy-a concept involving multiple types of engagement-highly relevant in current discourse.

Despite being a comparatively recent development, public diplomacy has considerably gained importance during the Cold War era, especially due to the increasing influence of both media and the public. This period, characterized by a dualistic power structure and the danger presented by nuclear armories, required that societies strike a balance between maintaining neutrality and facing the real threats of extinction, thus making the task of winning the favor and loyalty of the public a key strategic priority. In this context, many states, especially those viewed as global leaders, have engaged in public diplomacy practices as a means to garner popular backing for their foreign policy initiatives [43]. Public diplomacy has often been conceptualized as a form of propaganda and associated with press representatives espousing false news and has become all but part of ongoing psychic warfare campaigns[44].

....

40 Ece, İnan, "*Kamu Diplomasisi ve Halkla ilişkiler Ekseni*", "Kamu Diplomasisi, İstanbul, Tasam Yayınları, 2012, s. 63.

41 Benno, Signitzer, - Coombs, Wamser, "*Public Diplomacy: A Specific Govermental Public Relation Function*", Carl H. Botan & Vincent Hazleton. (Eds.) Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2006, s. 435.

42 Ömer, Kürkçüoğlu, "*Dış Politika Nedir? Türkiye'deki Dünü ve Bugünü*", http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr. 19 Eylül 2012, s. 3.

43 Eytan, Gilboa, "*Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy*", The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science , 2006, s. 55.

44 Mark, Leonard, "*Public Diplomacy*", London. Foreign Policy Center, 2002, s. 8.

Events like the end of the Cold War, the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the terrorist attacks of September 11 in the United States have shaken the balances within the international system over the last 30 years. These above developments have created risks to marginalize the geopolitical and geostrategic roles of medium and smaller countries while simultaneously paving the way for a number of countries to rise as new regional and global powers[45].

Today, it is underscored that the traditional structure of international relations has transformed to the extent that today there exists a global economic system, new global actors have been integrated into this system, numerous national actors have transformed into international organizations, and individuals are much more effective internationally than ever before[46]. Meanwhile, cultural and economic exchange processes are also developing at an incredible speed. With the defining characteristics of this new type of international system, government participation today is forced not only to engage in traditional diplomatic relations with foreign governments and agencies but also to participate in public diplomacy with either the citizens of other countries or the international community as such.

Factors such as the integration of international communication structures with democratic structures as well as with market-based economies, the integration of national and international politics, an increase in public support for international policies, as well as the "mediatization" of political discourse, have expanded the concept of international relations beyond the boundaries of states. At the same time, these factors have dramatically changed both the concept as well as the practice of diplomacy[47].

This has been particularly the case since the Second World War, when developments in international relations, coupled with the emergence of 47 newly independent nations, have prompted these nations to embark upon public diplomacy as a means of promoting their various policies, ideals, and cultural values to an international audience, and, further, becoming a player in that arena. On the contrary, the spread of democracy and its principles and values have given full strength to the role of public diplomacy. These various countries have altogether played the role of practitioners and objects of public diplomacy at one time or another. The Cold War saw, in the lead taken by the United States, the rise of the importance of concepts like freedom of thought, expression, and the press in relation to a liberal democratic ethos. This process allowed public diplomacy initiatives to be used in influencing the decisions of large groups that comprise the public opinion base, hence engaging these very groups by acquiring their support to legitimize policies put in place. In this context, public diplomacy has played a significant role in the legitimation process

---

45 Gonesh, "*Public diplomacy and…*," s. 3.

46 Signitzer, Wamser, "*Public Diplomacy…*," s. 437.

47 a.k., s. 437.

of both national and international policies, being an indispensable tool of public approval[48].

Since the second half of the 20th century, public diplomacy practices targeting conflict areas and beyond enemy borders have mainly been shaped by American, Canadian, and British experiences. The international environment emerging in the aftermath of World War II, and the order pinned with the Cold War, shaped both the theory and practices of public diplomacy. In the context - for example - it has been argued that one of the decisive factors through which communism was brought to an end was via U.S. and European public diplomacy efforts[49].

Public opinion is considered a determining element during the determination of foreign policy in current debate, and the increasing emphasis given to democratization is closely related to that. The fact that an issue has been supported by the public and receiving public support on related issues significantly enhance the legitimacy and success of political actors' policies in the international arena[50].

Public opinion can be described as either domestic or international, and it is also applicable to consider the concept of world public opinion[51]. The targets public diplomacy operates with could be defined as other nations' public, global audiences, people from different continents, other countries citizens, foreign people, communities, international public, in general described public groups, intercontinental people and organizations, as well as public bodies related to nation-states[52].

In this context, public diplomacy is composed of public opinion and official and civil communities beyond national borders. Edmund Gullion (1965), who first defined the concept of public diplomacy, described it as a term that encompasses the effects of public opinion on the creation and implementation of foreign policy, extending beyond classical diplomacy to cover different dimensions of international relations[53]. Walter Lippmann called it that by the 1950s, public diplomacy had progressed into the realm of international communication and propaganda. At this time, the concept was regarded as a psychological tool just like propaganda. During the 1960s, it came into prominence because of the United States Information Agency's (USIA) need to disassociate itself from the less-than-popular connotations of the terms "information" and "propaganda," hence the use of the term "public diplomacy" appeared[54].

Edmund Gullion was the first person ever to provide a modern definition of

---

48 Hans, Tuch, "*Communicating ith the World: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas*", St. Martin's Press Inc, 1990, s. 5.

49 Gyorgy, Szondi, "*Public Diplomacy and Nation Branding*", Clingendael. Nederland Institute of International Relations, 2008, s. 29.

50 Emine, Yavaşgel, "*Saygınlık Siyaseti: İletişim ve Dış Siyasa İlişkiselliği*", İstanbul, Kamu Diplomasisi Enstitüsü, 2012, s. 8.

51 Daver, "*Siyaset ve…*," s. 257

52 Kathy Fitzpatrick, "*Advancing the New Public Diplomacy-A Public Relation Perspective*", Nederlands. De Paul University, 2007, s. 96.

53 Demir, "*Kamu Diplomasisi…*," s. 6.

54 Nicholas, Cull, "*Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the past*", Los Angeles, Figueroa Press, 2009, s. 21.

public diplomacy. According to Edmund Gullion, public diplomacy is an attempt to influence the public opinion in the process of formulation and implementation of foreign policy. He states that public diplomacy includes those aspects of international relations outside the traditional domain of diplomacy, namely governments' attempts to shape the public opinion of other nations, contacts between the civil society and non-profit organisations across borders, as well as contacts between diplomats and journalists and intercultural communication processes.[55]

From another perspective, the term was also used during the presidency of Kennedy in the United States, by the Head of the United States Information Agency, Edward Murrow. He defined public diplomacy as a process by which non-official actors of one government or civilization communicate their view to the civil society actors and publics of another civilization[56]. The concept of public diplomacy has been known through various designations over the years; some scholars referred to it as "open diplomacy." However, this concept first received its designation as "public diplomacy" in the academic literature in 1972[57].

Public diplomacy is a communicative approach by which states engage in efforts to generate goodwill for their country's points of view, values, and national agenda before overseas publics; its goal is to influence foreign government behavior by influencing and changing the thinking of publics[58]. Hans N. Tuch characterized public diplomacy as a communicative process through which nations interact with international audiences to foster comprehension of their respective ideas, cultures, and strategic initiatives[59]. Similarly, Szondi described public diplomacy as a communicative endeavor involving engagement with foreign publics and the relationships established between states[60]. Public diplomacy broadly has included the direct and indirect impacts of public opinion and electoral preferences expressed by governments, individuals, citizens, or groups on the foreign policy choices of an alternative government[61].

Edmund Gullion, who early on concerned himself with the concept in its modern meaning, felt that the term "public diplomacy" labored under a set of negative connotations in its infancy[62]. This fact has been one of the major deterrents to the rise of understanding public diplomacy. Gunaratne has characterized public diplomacy as actions that successfully position nations in a dominant central role and are vital

---

55 (www.fletcher.tufts.edu, 2012)

56 İnan, "*Kamu Diplomasisi ve….*," s. 64.

57 Cull, "*Public Diplomacy…,*" s. 21-22.

58 Signitzer, *"Public Relations…,"* s.206.

59 Tuch, "*Communicating ith the World*…," s. 3.

60 Szondi, "*Public Diplomacy…,*" s. 13.

61 Nancy, Snow, "*Rethinking Public Diplomacy*", Handbook of Public Diplomacy, Ed. Nancy Snow. Philip M. Taylor. NY. Routledge, 2009, s. 6.

62 Cull, "*Public Diplomacy…,*" s. 19.

elements of global communication[63]. Certain scholars assert that the endeavors of these nations aimed at international audiences are articulated as fundamental aspects of fostering relationships and trust. This is considered a significant result that enhances the effectiveness of public diplomacy[64]. Public diplomacy refers to the official activities that countries carry out globally in the areas of information, education, and culture, with the purpose of persuading overseas populations to impact the decisions on foreign policy adopted by governments[65].

In new public diplomacy initiatives, the players comprise state actors, non-state actors, governments, government agencies, embassies, ministries of culture, cultural institutions, civil society, and diaspora. The players devise various strategies and collaborations to enhance the effectiveness of the programs of public diplomacy[66]. Public diplomacy allows the government to communicate with foreign citizens directly and, therefore, makes those citizens a significant part of international relations to themselves and foreign governments[67].

The Governments now consider it an imperative necessity to establish relations and communication not just with state actors but also with the public at large, civil society organizations, institutions, individuals, and such other actors, realizing the potential influence of public opinion in the effectiveness of foreign policy. Operating on the principle of enlightened choice was recognized as important in the emerging practices of public diplomacy. Information needs to be communicated with both internal and international publics in order to influence the perception and decision-making activities of target groups. This is not limited merely to policy making or risk assessment; rather, an attempt is made to establish communications with the help of various domains such as science, technology, industry, and even culture for the publics in question[68].

In analyzing the general purposes of public diplomacy, it strives to strengthen national identity, contribute to the solution of current as well as persisting problems in the international relations, and create an environment favorable for the application of policy. In doing this, Peterson lists five critical tasks of public diplomacy: the strategic and regulatory implementation of public diplomacy activities, to foster mutual exchange rather than traditional one-way mass broadcasting, expand the range of public sector partnerships, enhance the reach of public diplomacy resources, and expand the number of organizations involved with public diplomacy[69]. Moreover,

63 Shelton, Gunaratne, "*Public Diplomacy, Global Communication and World Order: An Analysis Based on Theory of Living Systems"*, SAGE, 2005, s. 759.

64 Cull, "*Public Diplomacy…,"* s. 10.

65 Szondi, "*Public Diplomacy…*," s. 7.

66 a.k., s. 18.

67 Tuch, "*Communicating ith the World...*," s. 4.

68 Gonesh, "*Public diplomacy…*," s. 3.

69 Peter, "*Public Diplomacy….,"* s. 78.

among these objectives, the primary and most impactful goal of public diplomacy is associated with aspects concerning national values and interests[70] .

Public diplomacy molds and leads the perceptions of foreign governments and their publics. The main objective of such an effort is indeed to develop a positive image in the minds of foreign audiences and to eliminate negative perceptions[71]. The areas in which public diplomacy may help achieve a country's goals are identified as follows:

• It creates a good impression in people's minds.

• It encourages positive inter relationships among members and enhances the building up of positive impressions.

• It builds this relationship through developing interpersonal connections in several dimensions of educational exchange programs, academic collaborations, travels, and consumptions.

• Through influencing the population, it helps in gaining support from the international population on different policies, which involve corporate investment and tourism, and even turns them into collaborators to achieve the nation's foreign policy[72].

According to Koschwitz, public diplomacy is driven by the desire for informing the public, seeking sympathy towards its international policy and right, advocating on one self's behalf, and creating a good image. These are the key elements that define what public diplomacy is all about in broad terms[73].

Fortner suggests that the main objective of public diplomacy is to influence foreign policy decisions of other countries by addressing communications to the citizens of those countries[74]. İnan explains goals of public diplomacy as an expression of expectations, cultural values, mutual understanding, and opinions of the other countries; correction of unfavorable impressions; and detection of common interests. These goals pave the way for establishing more profound and effective communication in international relations[75].

Public diplomacy encompasses more varied activities than traditional diplomacy. These range from the cultural diplomacy of directly promoting certain

---

70 Gonesh, *Public diplomacy…,*," s. 4.

71 Abdullah, Özkan, "*Türkiye'nin Kalkınma Yardımlarında Kamu Diplomasisi Perspektifi*", İstanbul, Kamu Diplomasi Enstitüsü, 2012, s. 13.

72 Leonard, Mark, *" Public Diplomacy*", London, Foreign Policy Center, 2002, s. 10.

73 Signitzer, "*Public Relations…*," s.137-147.

74 Robert, Fortner, "*International communication*", Wadsworth Publishing, 1993, s. 278.

75 İnan,"*Kamu Diplomasisi…,"* s. 65.

policies through to using the artistic initiatives and products to build support from the international publics (Giles Scott-Smith, 2009). According to Cull, public diplomacy consists of six integral components: listening and understanding, advocacy, cultural exchanges, education programs, international broadcasting, and psychological warfare[76]. The tools and techniques of implementation for public diplomacy tend to include international publications, student exchange programs in scientific and cultural spheres of life, scholarships, artist and intellectual participation in conferences, festivals, or exhibitions, business collaborations, establishing joint associations, learning the other country's language, and cultural center establishment. Such components and techniques would be used to ensure effective implementation of public diplomacy[77]. For this reason, different scholars and practitioners have classified public diplomacy initiatives in the following manner accordingly[78]:

• Information provision, publication and management of information relevant to current events and crises;

• Influence, sustained persuasion operations intended to effect a change in attitude among the target audience of a larger population;

• Engagement, "implies the nurturing of long-term relationships to build trust and mutual understanding between different actors, such as groups, organizations, and countries.".

The most common instruments of public diplomacy efforts are: publications-books, magazines; audiovisuals-movies, TV and radio programs; cultural and artistic performances-exhibitions, concerts, plays, and other showcases; trade fairs; as well as a host of other publicity tools. These tools are used to engage in productive communication with target audiences and create a positive perception. Besides, areas of trade, export, and tourism have turned out to be critical areas of concentration in the public diplomacy efforts of governments. Multinational corporations undeniably have already become one of the most important contributors to the United States' public diplomacy. It was observed that these businesses were in direct contact with the governments of other nations through the State Department, and some of the well-known firms identified are General Motors, General Electric, Microsoft, AT&T, Mobil Oil, Shell, BP, and Ford Motor

As public diplomacy has been understood in an ever-evolving fashion, the set of activities conceived to promote understanding and appreciation for a country's position, manners, ethos, and foreign policy, especially on the part of overseas publics, has come to the fore. Such efforts are intended to improve a nation's image and build

---

76 Cull, "*Public Diplomacy...,*" s. 10-11.

77 Demir, "*Kamu Diplomasisi…,*" s. 6-7.

78 John, Kelley, "*Between "Take-offs" and "Crash Landings*", Situational Aspects of Public Diplomacy" Handbook of Public Diplomacy. Nancy Snow and Philip M. Taylor (der.) içinde. Routledge, 2009, s. 73.

positive perceptions in the context of international relations[79]. Accordingly, public diplomacy would involve communication programs "targeting primarily instruction of domestic media and publics as well as engaging foreign citizens, opinion leaders, and media representatives". As Tuch observes, public diplomacy addressed to overseas audiences differs from public affairs oriented to domestic constituencies in the merely partial overlapping of the two contexts of public opinion, but also in terms of intent and method[80]. In order to further explain the relationship between public diplomacy and its domestic audience, two main frameworks can be used. One is the support of the domestic public for foreign policy projects, the other is a matter of making international political and diplomatic ambitions known to the home audience[81].

Working with the target audience about a particular problem leads to effectiveness by gaining the support of this target audience. In this respect, public diplomacy activities targeting the home audience are connected with foreign public-oriented activities[82].

Szondi postulates that another goal of public diplomacy in the 21st century is a diversification of nations' target audiences; he shows the need to attract the support of the domestic audience regarding international political issues but at the same time underlines the idea of "intermestic," which describes the interconnection of home and foreign policy issues[83]. He emphasizes that one of the basic ingredients imported into foreign policy from after the Cold War Era has been eradication of boundaries separating domestic and international politics; accordingly, events determined in one sphere directly affect issues in the other. A further factor to consider is the decreased impact of hard power strategies at the international level, as elements of soft power, including socio-cultural ties and economic investments, prove more viable and to have more sway compared with military power, often cited as hard power[84].

Public diplomacy today became urgent, especially due to the increasingly important role of target audiences for countries. Szondi underlines support by the home public in international relations as being important too. He points out the concept "intermestic" in this respect and suggests it has played a vital role in developing and increasing effectiveness for public diplomacy[85].

---

79 Tuch, "*Communicating ith the World...,*" s. 8.

80 a.k., s. 8.

81 Szondi, "*Public Diplomacy...,*" s. 7.

82 Yavaşgel, "*Saygınlık Siyaseti…,*" s. 8.

83 Szondi, "*Public Diplomacy...,*" s. 304.

84 Efegil, Erhan, "*Kamu Diplomasisine İlişkin Görüşler ve Türk Dış Politikasının Durumu. Ak Parti ve MHP'nin Söylemlerinin Karşılaştırılması*". Kamu Diplomasisi. İstanbul. Tasam Yayınları, 2012, s. 161.

85 Szondi, "*Public Diplomacy...,*" s. 304.

2. PARADIPLOMACY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF LOCAL FOREIGN POLICY

While the mutual dependencies are on a surge day by day with more pronounced globalization, problems of humanity converted into issues at the international domain that needed to be felt and solved[86].

This result has revealed the international repercussions and scope of progress at the local level, and the role of local and global interactions has gradually increased, as the solution of some global problems, such as climate, requires interventions at the local level[87].

As a result of these processes, it has become a very large structure for the solution of some problems by challenging the nation states the most. This situation has brought along the questioning of the functionality of nation states and new orientations. Voicu 2001. This situation has also been considered by some scholars as a crisis of the nation state by Xi[88].

Local and regional developments have progressed with globalization, explained by Hocking (1999) as other supporting forces of the process, and these approaches have influenced the dynamics in international relations, encouraging new forms of interaction at the local and regional level.

In Keating's (1996) perspective, with the wider scope of globalization, the importance of owning a territory and having an identity associated with that territory has diminished and local elements have been reconstructed in this environment where they have the opportunity to express themselves more. Changing balances also trigger the transformation of identities and understandings of sovereignty.

Soldatos and Michelmann[89] emphasized that with the removal of all barriers in a free market environment, developments in communication tools have led to a structural and functional weakening of countries and a new era in diplomacy. In this context, it is stated that today's existing political structures and institutions are less capable of responding effectively to situations or dealing with problems[90].

86   Zarghani, Ranjkesh-Eskandaran., "*City Diplomacy, Analysis of the Role of Cities as the New Actor in International Relations*" Urban-Regional Studies and Research Journal, 5 (20), 2014, s. 34..

87   Gençkaya, Ömer, Kaya Kemal, "*İstanbul ilçe belediyelerinin dış ilişkileri*" Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi, 1 (3), 2018, s. 304.

88   Stephane, Paquin, Guy Lachapelle, "*Why Do Sub-States and Regions Practice International Relations. Mastering Globalization: New Sub-States"* Governance and Strategies, G. Lachapelle ve S. Paquin (Der.) içinde, Oxon: Routledge, 2005, s. 81.

89   Panayotıs, Soldatos, "*An Explanatory Framework for the Study of Federated States as Foreign-policy Actors*", Federalism and International Relations: The Role of Subnational Units, H. J. Michelmann ve P. Soldatos (Der.) içinde, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990, s. 130-132.

90   Dan Koon, Chan, "*City Diplomacy and Glocal Governance: Revitalizing Cosmopolitan Democracy*", Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, 29 (2), 2016, s. 134-135.

In this framework, the concepts and assumptions widely shared in the discipline of International Relations, particularly the state-centric perspective, were substantially questioned. The challenge thus became to revise some of the key assumptions in the discipline and formulate new ways of visioning the world (Duran, 2016). This period, enriched by new concepts developed with respect to the shortcomings of the ones in existence, has become "post-diplomatic" since it finds its place outside state boundaries and beyond traditional forms of diplomacy[91]. The development in this regard categorically alters understanding and practices of diplomacy.

At the same time, the diplomacy conducted by states still plays a significant role in shaping international politics. However, this does not prevent other actors from entering the foreign policy arena and operating in accordance with their interests. In this framework, diplomacy continues to evolve as a dynamic process[92]. The increasing influence of sub-national actors in the global diplomatic sphere has led to an evolution in traditional diplomacy and foreign policy, necessitating a reevaluation of existing understandings of these topics[93].

In a story by the Russian author Ivan Krylov, a museum visitor misses a giant elephant while focusing on the small exhibits presented at the museum. Tavares uses this analogy to define the phenomenon of paradiplomacy as the "elephant" in the new relationships among nations[94]. This analogy highlights that the integration of many new actors, especially cities, into international politics has been overlooked. Mostly, following Tavares, many researchers working in the foreign policy field consider paradiplomacy to be insignificant compared with the policies of the central government currently being carried out with stronger infrastructures and resources. However, from Tavares's point of view, it is rather illogical to operate such comparisons without taking into consideration different dynamics.

Due to their incompetent expression of themselves in the activities of international relations, country administrations mechanisms, have contributed to the development of the concept of diplomacy[95].

As a phenomenon of International Relations, paradiplomacy first appeared in the literature through the discussion of diplomacy by Rohan Butler in his book. The

91 Inaki, Aguirre, "*Making Sense of Paradiplomacy?"* An Intertextual Enquiry about a Concept in Search of a Definition. Regional and Federal Studies, 9(1), 1999, s. 205.

92 Susiatiningsih, Hermini vd., "Decentralization in International Relations: A Study of Semarang City's Paradiplomacy. ICENIS Conference: Semerang-Endonezya, 2018, Ağustos 14-15.

93 Cornago, Noé. (2010). On the Normalization of Sub-State Diplomacy. The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, 5, 2010, s. 11.

94 Rodrigo, Tavares, "*Paradiplomacy: Cities and States as Global Players*", New York: Oxford University Press, 2016, s. 125.

95 Khali, Mohammed - Francis Owtram, "*Paradiplomacy of Regional Governments in International Relations:* The Foreign Relations of the Kurdistan Regional Government (2003 – 2010). Iran and the Caucasus, 18, 2014, s. 67.

term paradiplomacy was defined by[96] Butler, as informal or clandestine negotiations operating in the shadow of traditional diplomacy, supplementing or opposing it. With the development of the concept of paradiplomacy, those situations wherein the sub-state actors practice their diplomacies without using the state as an instrument or without ever feeling an obligation to report to the state are easily expressed. However, one should notice that activities conducted by sub-state actors in order to implement the foreign policy of the central government do not fall under paradiplomacy.

Diplomacy can be defined as the work of countries representing their interests in negotiation but excluding violence. It is generally recognized as synonymous with a country's foreign policy. The word paradiplomacy is a combination of the words "para" and "diplomacy." The coming together of these two words underlines the fact that paradiplomatic work is carried out in addition to traditional diplomacy, which is performed using the central states in the international system. Because of this, paradiplomacy should not be interpreted as a concept negating either the central role of states in the framework of diplomacy or the hierarchical prominence of objectives defined by the government over the priorities of sub-state actors. Consequently, within this framework, paradiplomacy should be regarded as a complementary component to the concept of diplomacy in so far as it defines the increasing diplomatic action of sub-state actors and covers a gap in the literature.[97]

Another proposal put forward with respect to the etymology of the term paradiplomacy refers to the fact that the term paradiplomacy is constituted by adding the Greek prefix "para" to the word "diplomacy". The Greek prefix "para" offers additions such as "beside", "in addition to", "alongside", "instead of", or "as a helper". In this respect, paradiplomacy is viewed as an action that supports, completes, corrects, or reproduces the diplomatic action of nation-states and it even exists outside these actions, challenging them (Tavares, 2016a: 8).

The major characteristic distinguishing paradiplomacy from diplomacy would be that the non-state actors in paradiplomatic undertakings are not officialized as such under international law. That is, the actors practicing paradiplomacy have not been officially afforded much opportunity to become members of an international organization or even to become a party to an international treaty for a long time. Generally, actors are bound to take part as a mechanism representing their countries in activities carried out within international institutions or international negotiations (Paquin 2018: 7).

While this is the case, the shifting and developing nature of the norms of international law within a temporal framework allows the aforementioned fundamental

---

96 Rohan, Butler, "*Paradiplomacy. Studies in diplomatic history and historiography*", A. Sarkissian (Der.) içinde, Londra: Longman, 1961, s. 13.

97 Seven, Erdoğan, "*Dönüşen Diplomasinin Yeni Yüzü: Paradiplomasi*", Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 24-3, 2020, s. 498.

difference between the two entities of diplomacy and local diplomatic activity to, at times, become weak and even ostensibly nullified. Ultimately, it has been seen that international law often analyses local diplomatic activities as falling more squarely within a legal context over time (Chechi, 2018). Most United Nations agencies, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Development Programme, and the United Nations Children's Fund involve local diplomatic actors and their activities. Even though the actors proclaim their loyalty to the goals set by such agencies, they also may contribute to the financial structure of such an institution or request their assistance. For Cornago[98] the above situation is "a transformation of the understanding of multilateralism" in transnational politics.

The paradiplomatic action of local actors can be formal or informal. Sometimes these actors establish permanent relations, sometimes temporary links. The partners of these relations may come either from the public or private sphere. Usually-while this type of paradiplomatic activity deals with economic and social issues-political problems may come to the fore.

According to Soldatos (1990) these activities can either be global or local. Through global activities, the objective is to realize an outcome that impacts the international system because of efforts by the subnational actors. A good example in this area is activities that a local actor undertakes aiming at changing the global climate change process. Whereas local activities denote actions that have minor, even local impacts on the environment immediately surrounding; activities creating a larger effect, regardless of proximity, are conveyed as extensive (macro) paradiplomatic actions.

Duchacek (1990) classifies the so-called paradiplomatic activities into three major types. The first one is a category of interaction in border regions due to geographic proximity, or cross-border regional paradiplomacy. Since the actors in the aforementioned setting are usually under similar geographic conditions, there arises a need to find solutions for common problems or areas of interest such as environmental pollution, water resource management, or energy transportation. The development of communicational and transportation infrastructure on both sides of the border creates a suitable ground for para diplomacy. For example, the intense relationships and trade between the city of Quebec in Canada and the state of New York in the USA or between the Catalonia region in Spain and cities in France are examples of this situation that come into mind right away[99]. A second category is defined as transregional or macroregional paradiplomacy, showing the relations established with another non-bordering subnational actor. In this latter case, which has more elements of preference than in the first type, local actors join forces for the protection of economic, environmental, or cultural interests and may perform specific

98 Cornago, "*On the Normalization of Sub-State*….," s. 32-33

99 Paquin, Lachapelle, "*Why Do Sub-States and Regions Practice International*….," s. 81.

actions to attain those objectives. The third type of paradiplomacy is called global paradiplomacy, which is effective in the international arena and normally includes local actors beside national actors.

This categorization serves as an example that serves towards improving the comprehension of the different types of actions and functions of the local actors in the global context (Sönmez, 2014). Where there are several literature on what non-state actors would do in the international scene, it indicates that there are indeed multi layer approaches on paradiplomacy, in addition to the differences in opinions of scholars who tackle the issues[100]. In such a setting, Alvarez (2020) has also noted that although over thirty years have elapsed since the first works on the subject of paradiplomacy, the literature with which this activity is studied remains lacking a conceptual framework. In order to fill this conceptual void, he advocates for the promotion of collaborative discourse among academics working in this area.

However, while various authors have come up with a number of terms to describe the conducts that involve diplomacy by ethnic groups, the term that is widely used as the more general yet similar is paradiplomacy. The relative frequency with which the term paradiplomacy is used rather than the other alternative terms does not mean that there are no problems associated with it. The main problem lies in the high degree of uncertainty surrounding the concept[101].

In this context, the paradiplomatic activities of non-state actors can be considered as a throwback to the previous era, or at least to the pre-national state era. Indeed, it is known that the first diplomatic activities in the modern sense were carried out between the city-states of northern Italy in the pre-nation state period[102].

It has been observed that non-state actors started to be effective in the world especially after World War II[103]. An important turning point in terms of paradiplomacy was the union established between a group of local governments on the Franco-German border in 1947 after the war. Through this union, these local governments aimed to contribute to the development of friendly relations and peace between these two countries, which were in relentless conflict with each other between the two global wars[104]. This reveals that in the second half of the 20th century, Europe became a continent where paradiplomatic activities flourished and were intensively observed. After the 1960s, the role of nation-states declined significantly, which led

100 Cornago, "*On the Normalization of Sub-State*….," s. 33.

101 Alexander, Kuznetsov, "*Theory and Practice of Paradiplomacy: Subnational Governments in International Affairs*", Routledge Press, 2015, s. 28-29

102 Tavares, "*Paradiplomacy: Cities…,"* s. 10.

103 Birgül, Demirtaş, "*Türkiye'de Yerel Yönetimlerin Dış İlişkilerinin Analizi: Merkez-Çevre Etkileşimini Yeniden Düşünme",* Uluslararası İlişkiler, 13 (52), 2016, s. 168.

104 Tavares, "*Paradiplomacy: Cities…",* s. 11-13

to the paradiplomatic activities that differed from the previous periods[105]. In this period, local actors began to have a legal basis for paradiplomatic activities. In the early 1970s, Keohane and Nye argued that world politics could not be understood by focusing only on states or inter-state connections.

The introduction of the concept of paradiplomacy into international relations can by and large be attributed to the influence of comparative politics and in particular to the federalism studies which began particularly in the 1980s. In such regard, Aguirre[106] for instance observes that the word was first used in 1980s paradigm of Canadian politics where Federal Systems by Ivo Duchacek and Panayotis Soldatos studied Quebec and the contours of its political orbit and other peripheral regions because the concept of diplomacy was insufficient to explain the occurrence of new confluxines within multilingual entities. Much of the literature on paradiplomacy in the first place emphasized its incidence within the Old World, especially, many sub-national polities were very much involved in some sort of paradiplomacy apart from the American continent (Liu & Son:2020). The objective of these studies which were studying the Federal systems was not to provide the cause of exordium of paradigm shift called paradiplomacy but to make clear the development of federal systems due to paradiplomacy. These early paradigms considered paradiplomacy as mainly strategies that were designed by the authorities in federal states in response to external factors such as changes in the federal structure or the global order[107].

When evaluating the contemporary form of the concept, a significant expansion is observed compared to the initial period. Ackrén[108] notes that non-state actors were initially used only to explain the economic relations of countries. The work published in 1990 by Hans J. Michelmann and Panayotis Soldatos serves as a source for theoretical studies on paradiplomacy. This study not only defines paradiplomacy but also addresses details regarding the actors involved in paradiplomatic activities. A more methodical approach has been developed for the dissolution of paradiplomacy in this research. Many subsequent studies conducted by scholars interested in the subject have focused on the paradiplomatic behaviors of various non-state actors around the world, based on the emerging theoretical infrastructure related to paradiplomacy.

With the end of the Cold War and the transformation process in the international system, the value of phenomena like paradiplomacy has increased. Advances in communication technologies have facilitated these actors' participation in paradiplomatic activities[109]. The network allows non-state actors to communicate

105 Soldatos, "*An Explanatory Framework for the Study…*," s. 130.

106 Aguirre, "*Making Sense of Paradiplomacy…,*" s. 185.

107 Kuznetsov, "*Theory and Practice…,*" s. 55

108 Maria, Ackrén, "*Diplomacy and Paradiplomacy in the North Atlantic and the Arctic—A Comparative Approach*", The Global Arctic Handbook, M. Finger and L. Heininen (Der) içinde, Springer, 2019, s. 236.

109 Prakash, Jha, "*Federalism, Regionalism and States' Paradiplomacy in India. Federalism in India: Towards a Fresh Balance of Power*", L. Lobo ve J. Shah (Der.) içinde, Rawat Publication, 2014, s. 27

easily and at low cost through smartphones and other digital channels, enabling them to effortlessly access the information they need. This situation has contributed to the widespread adoption of paradiplomacy practices (Mursitama & Lee, 2018). In the post-Cold War period, in addition to technological developments, changes in the global economy and the increased mobility of capital have led to a weakening of central authority in nation-states and the emergence of a new type of federalism. Moreover, the increasing number of communication and transportation infrastructures at the international level has also affected this situation. As a result of these developments, the division of labor between the local and the central has been reshaped (Joenniemi & Sergunin: 2014).

In the period following 1990, when there was an increase in academic studies on the diplomatic activities of local actors, it has been observed that some local actors gained more visibility in the literature[110].

With the beginning of the 2000s, the influence of paradiplomacy has gradually increased. Paradiplomacy has now evolved from being an exclusive phenomenon of federal states or advanced democracies to a global experience observed in states with different structures and systems around the world[111]. In contrast, conducting paradiplomatic activities in dominant authoritarian systems is more challenging compared to democratic countries[112]. As a global experience, paradiplomacy manifests itself in various ways across different locations in the world, adopting different tools and goals depending on the context in which it exists.

3. PARADIPLOMACY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE UNION OF TURKISH WORLD MUNICIPALITIES (TDBB)

The Union of Turkish World Municipalities[113] (TDBB) operates with the aim of executing projects related to city management in countries where Turkic languages and dialects are spoken, as well as in regions with geographical, historical, and cultural ties. In today's world, increasing interdependencies and the impact of globalization have transformed global issues into challenges that are felt on an international scale and require urgent solutions. Consequently, local developments have inevitably gained international dimensions and influence. Some global issues, such as environmental concerns, necessitate interventions at the local level.

In this study, focus is placed on the programs and projects conducted by the Union of Turkish World Municipalities, which, with nearly 1,200 member municipalities from 30 different countries, works to enhance cooperation between local governments in friendly and brotherly countries, spanning from the Balkans

---

110 Demirtaş, "*Türkiye'de Yerel Yönetimlerin…*," s. 152.
111 Tavares, "*Paradiplomacy: Cities…*," s. 14.
112 Paquin, Lachapelle, "*Why Do Sub-States…*," s. 7.
113 https://www.tdbb.org.tr/?lang=tr, 10.11.2024

to the Caucasus and Central Asia (https://www.tdbb.org.tr/?lang=en). The activities of the Union of Turkish World Municipalities, as published in its annual reports from 2020 to 2023, are examined through qualitative research methods, specifically document analysis. The activities conducted during this period are categorized by field of impact. These fields include city and municipal services, social and cultural services, educational services, and the development of international relations.

City and Municipal Services

Projects such as park construction, Veterans' Day events, inauguration of monuments for fallen soldiers, urban governance, development of cultural and artistic spaces, smart cities, economic, technical, and social development of cities, and urban management. Furthermore, activities include the opening of new service buildings, financial support to member municipalities, building renovation, inauguration ceremonies, inter-municipal cooperation, provision of vehicles and materials, fuel assistance, healthcare support, and the opening of various public spaces like parks and squares.

Social and Cultural Services

Cultural festivals, Nowruz events, Sister City initiatives, Sister City protocol, Sister City activities, World Ethnosport Confederation, water and wastewater services, transportation support, soft power publications, public diplomacy literature, culture center projects, sports area organization, local food festival organization, culture week organization, material support for nursing homes, greenhouse facilities support projects, books and periodicals, cooperation with professional chambers, tourism programs for historical and cultural sites, zero waste projects, public health services for disadvantaged groups in local governments, environmental cleanliness, social municipal services, home care services, national solidarity campaigns, awards for the Turkish World Documentary Film Festival, and publications on local agendas in Eurasia for Winter 2020, Spring 2020, and Summer 2020, disinfection activities, investments in digital technologies, services during the COVID-19 pandemic, collaboration with civil society, the private sector, and city residents during the pandemic, information and experience sharing on the role of municipalities during the pandemic, international conference on urban governance post-COVID-19, street naming ceremonies, and Konya Poets' Festival, along with media coverage of TDBB.

Educational Services

Organization of symposiums, conferences, congresses, panels, seminars, expert training, development of kindergartens, dormitory renovation, stationery support, school building renovation projects, vocational training courses, Young Local Administrators Summer School Project, children's sports areas, Municipality Academy Project, cooperation management between local governments and the private sector, cooperation management training programs, inter-university cooperation, joint projects with graduate programs, support for master's theses, support for doctoral

theses, experience-sharing programs, kindergarten visits, family and child education centers, museum visits, Istanbul cultural tours, public transportation services, social and financial aid, support programs for graduate students, and the Turkish World Science and Culture Festival, along with stationery support projects.

Development of International Relations

Commercial relations, international information and experience sharing, support for participation in international children's festivals, cooperation protocols, international visits, support for participation in international fairs, internship opportunities for foreign students, support for participation in international folklore festivals, support for participation in the Turkish World Documentary Film Festival, support for participation in international environmental fairs, support for participation in the International Urban Planning Fair, bilateral relations, cooperation protocols, international visits, cooperation with foreign trade organizations, international Issyk-Kul Forum, events related to Chingiz Aytmatov, Turkey's public diplomacy, public diplomacy initiatives, city diplomacy, soft power strategies, visits and representation activities in Eurasia, joint projects, celebration rallies for the liberation of Karabakh, memorial ceremonies for the victims of the Khojaly massacre, environmentally friendly winter tourism cooperation projects, project partnerships with the Northeast Anatolia Development Agency, and events for international student gatherings.

CONCLUSION

In today's world, the trends of regionalization and localization coincide with the process of globalization. This situation has allowed for local interventions in issues that require global solutions. At the same time, diplomacy conducted by states continues to play a significant role in international policies. The increasing effectiveness of local actors in international platforms has inevitably led to a reassessment of the general assumptions regarding diplomacy and foreign policy. In this context, the insufficient presence of non-state actors in classical diplomatic activities has necessitated the emergence of a separate concept known as "paradiplomacy."

Paradiplomacy is defined as activities conducted under the shadow of official diplomacy or those that complement it. With the emergence of paradiplomacy, sub-national actors are involved in diplomacy without turning the state into a mere intermediary. For instance, it is possible to assess their activities concerning issues addressed at a global level within this framework.

Paradiplomacy refers to the activities of local governments in the international arena. It signifies the process by which sub-national actors independently develop diplomatic, economic, socio-cultural, and political relations with other countries, beyond the state's external public relations. The historical development and duration of paradiplomacy are closely related to the structure of international relations, globalization, localization, and the internal political situations of states.

A look at the history of paradiplomacy reveals that it dates back to the 20th century. The increase in urbanization, along with the transformation of economic and trade structures, has made its emergence more pronounced. However, the relationships between cities during this period primarily exhibited a commercial focus.

The development process of paradiplomacy can be evaluated in four stages. The first stage can be seen as the early 20th century, particularly with the increase of urbanization and trade relations in Western Europe. The second stage occurred after World War II, as the United Nations (UN) facilitated a more active role for local governments, enabling the development of paradiplomacy. The stage when paradiplomacy began to spread globally can be identified in the 1980s and 1990s, coinciding with the increase in globalization. The final stage is the 21st century, marking a period in which paradiplomacy has fully institutionalized. During this period, local governments have actively participated in international platforms, both in cultural cooperation and trade agreements. For example, the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group is one of the most significant paradiplomatic networks formed by major cities committed to combating climate change globally.

Paradiplomacy functions as a complementary mechanism to the existing diplomacy of states. Its main contributions include strengthening international connections, producing local solutions to global problems, fostering inter-community cultural exchanges, and facilitating economic development in countries. In summary, paradiplomacy acts as a strategic tool that enhances the power of local governments in the international arena within the intertwined processes of globalization and localization in today's world.

Another main aim of this study, which examines paradiplomacy within a theoretical framework, is to evaluate the activities of the Turkish World Municipalities Union (TDBB) as a practicing actor of paradiplomacy. The Union is an organization aimed at enhancing the cooperation capacities of local governments in Turkic-speaking countries. The activities carried out by the Turkish World Municipalities Union can be categorized into areas such as urban and municipal services, social and cultural services, educational services, and the development of international relations.

In the area of urban and municipal services, the union facilitates knowledge and experience sharing among its members, enabling local governments to produce more efficient solutions suitable for contemporary urbanization and infrastructure services. Through social and cultural activities, it contributes significantly to strengthening the common values of the Turkic world. Similarly, the union supports the qualitative enhancement of human capital in local governments through its educational services (conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.). Additionally, it plays a major role in developing international relations among member cities.

The Turkish World Municipalities Union not only engages in activities among countries that speak Turkic languages but also significantly contributes to the

development and internationalization of local governments on a global scale. As a result, the Turkish World Municipalities Union operates as a pioneer of significant developments in the field of paradiplomacy.

In conclusion, the mission undertaken by the Turkish World Municipalities Union is likely to have a multiplier effect in future solidarity, unity, and cooperation processes that the Turkic world will build upon common values.

REFERENCE

Ackrén, Maria, "Diplomacy and Paradiplomacy in the North Atlantic and the Arctic—A Comparative Approach", *The Global Arctic Handbook*, M. Finger and L. Heininen (Der) içinde, Springer, 2019

Aguirre, Inaki, "Making Sense of Paradiplomacy?" *An Intertextual Enquiry about a Concept in Search of a Definition. Regional and Federal Studies*, 9(1), 1999

Butler, Rohan, "Paradiplomacy. Studies in diplomatic history and historiography", A. Sarkissian (Der.) içinde, Londra: Longman, 1961

Chan, Dan Koon, "City Diplomacy and Glocal Governance: Revitalizing Cosmopolitan Democracy", *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 29 (2), 2016

Cull, Nicholas, *Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the past*, Los Angeles, Figueroa Press, 2009

Demir, Vedat, *Kamu Diplomasisi ve Yumuşak Güç*, İstanbul. Beta Yayınları, 2012

Demirtaş, Birgül, "Türkiye'de Yerel Yönetimlerin Dış İlişkilerinin Analizi: Merkez-Çevre Etkileşimini Yeniden Düşünme", *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 13 (52), 2016

Efegil, Erhan, "Kamu Diplomasisine İlişkin Görüşler ve Türk Dış Politikasının Durumu. Ak Parti ve MHP'nin Söylemlerinin Karşılaştırılması", *Kamu Diplomasisi*, İstanbul. Tasam Yayınları, 2012

Erdoğan, Seven, "Dönüşen Diplomasinin Yeni Yüzü: Paradiplomasi", *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 24-3, 2020

Evans , Graham– Jeffrey Newnham, *Uluslararası İlişkiler Sözlüğü*, (Çev. H. Ahsen Utku), İstanbul: Gökkubbe, 2007

Fitzpatrick, Kathy, *Advancing the New Public Diplomacy-A Public Relation Perspective*, Nederlands. De Paul University, 2007

Fortner, Robert, *International communication*, Wadsworth Publishing, 1993

Gençkaya, Ömer, Kaya Kemal, "İstanbul ilçe belediyelerinin dış ilişkileri", *Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi*, 1 (3), 2018

Gilboa, Eytan, "Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy", *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* , 2006

Gonesh, Ashvin - Jan Melissen, *Public diplomacy: improving practice,* Netherlands institute of international relations. Clingendael, 2005

Gönlübol, Mehmet, *Uluslararası Politika: İlkeler, Kavramlar, Kurumlar*, Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 2000

Gunaratne, Shelton, *Public Diplomacy, Global Communication and World Order: An Analysis Based on Theory of Living Systems*, SAGE, 2005

Hermini, Susiatiningsih vd., *Decentralization in International Relations: A Study of Semarang City's Paradiplomacy*. ICENIS Conference: Semerang-Endonezya, 2018

İnan, Ece, *Kamu Diplomasisi ve Halkla ilişkiler Ekseni*, "Kamu Diplomasisi, İstanbul, Tasam Yayınları, 2012

İskit, Temel, *Diplomasi: Tarihi, Teorisi, Kurumları ve Uygulaması*, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları. 4. Baskı., 2007

Jha, Prakash, "Federalism, Regionalism and States' Paradiplomacy in India. Federalism in India: Towards a Fresh Balance of Power", L. Lobo ve J. Shah (Der.) içinde, Rawat Publication, 2014

Kelley, John, "Between "Take-offs" and "Crash Landings", Situational Aspects of Public Diplomacy" Handbook of Public Diplomacy. Nancy Snow and Philip M. Taylor (der.) içinde. Routledge, 2009

Kuznetsov, Alexander, *Theory and Practice of Paradiplomacy: Subnational Governments in International Affairs*, Routledge Press, 2015

Kürkçüoğlu, Ömer, "Dış Politika Nedir? Türkiye'deki Dünü ve Bugünü", http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr. 19 Eylül 2012

Leonard, Mark, *Public Diplomacy*, London. Foreign Policy Center, 2002

Mark, Leonard, *Public Diplomacy*, London, Foreign Policy Center, 2002

Mohammed, Khali – Francis Owtram, *Paradiplomacy of Regional Governments in International Relations: The Foreign Relations of the Kurdistan Regional Government (2003 – 2010).* Iran and the Caucasus, 18, 2014

Nancy, Snow, *Rethinking Public Diplomacy*, Handbook of Public Diplomacy, Ed. Nancy Snow. Philip M. Taylor. NY. Routledge, 2009

Noé, Cornago, "On the Normalization of Sub-State Diplomacy", *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 5, 2010

Özkan, Abdullah, *Türkiye'nin Kalkınma Yardımlarında Kamu Diplomasisi Perspektifi*, İstanbul, Kamu Diplomasi Enstitüsü, 2012

Paquin, Stephane- Guy Lachapelle, *Why Do Sub-States and Regions Practice International Relations. Mastering Globalization: New Sub-States*, Governance and Strategies, G. Lachapelle ve S. Paquin (Der.) içinde, Oxon: Routledge, 2005

Peter, Peterson, "Public Diplomacy and the War on Terrorism". *Foreign Affairs*. Vol. 81. No: 5. 2008

Ranjkesh , Zarghani - Eskandaran., "City Diplomacy, Analysis of the Role of Cities as the New Actor in International Relations", *Urban-Regional Studies and Research Journal*, 5 (20), 2014

Signitzer, Benno, - Coombs Wamser, *Public Diplomacy: A Specific Govermental Public Relation Function,* Carl H. Botan & Vincent Hazleton. (Eds.) Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2006

Soldatos, Panayotıs, *An Explanatory Framework for the Study of Federated States as Foreign-policy Actors*, Federalism and International Relations: The Role of Subnational Units, H. J. Michelmann ve P. Soldatos (Der.) içinde, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990

Sönmezoğlu, Faruk, *Uluslararası İlişkilere Giriş*, İstanbul. Der Yay., 2005

Szondi, Gyorgy, *Public Diplomacy and Nation Branding*, Clingendael. Nederland Institute of International Relations, 2008

Tavares, Rodrigo, *Paradiplomacy: Cities and States as Global Players*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2016

Tuch, Hans, *Communicating ith the World: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas*, St. Martin's Press Inc, 1990

Tuncer, Hüner, *Eski ve Yeni Diplomasi*, Ankara, Ümit Yayıncılık, 2009

Yavaşgel, Emine, *Saygınlık Siyaseti: İletişim ve Dış Siyasa İlişkiselliği*, İstanbul, Kamu Diplomasisi Enstitüsü, 2012

Yinanç, Refet, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun Dış Politika Anlayışı ve Uygulamaları*, Türk Dış Politikası 1919-2008, Ankara, Platin Yayınları, 2008