ARTICLE

Understanding the Distinguishing Features of Post-Westphalian Diplomacy

Ebru OĞURLU*

Abstract

Diplomacy is traditionally an instrument used by states to develop and sustain peaceful and predictable relations among themselves. This paper discusses the transformation of traditional diplomacy into global diplomacy by referring to modifications in four components of diplomacy: context, rules and norms, channels of communication, and actors and roles. After discussing the historical evolution of diplomacy, this paper argues that diplomacy has transformed in order to adapt itself to the newly emerging conditions of the 21st century. It has become a multi-actor and multi-level network phenomenon. However, this diplomatic transformation has not diluted the traditional sovereignty-based diplomacy. As states maintain their ultimate power and authority in the globalized system, so does state diplomacy.

Keywords

Introduction

Diplomacy depends on the prior existence of human societies with basic needs for security as well as communication. The performance of these basic functions has differed from century to century and from society to society.

* Assoc. Prof., European University of Lefke, Department of International Relations, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, E-mail: eogurlu@eul.edu.tr.

However, diplomacy has always been there, continuously adapting itself to the changing conditions. In this respect, the transformation of the Westphalian system with the end of the Cold War, which set up a completely new international system, resulted in radical impacts on the nature of state sovereignty and sovereignty-based state functions including diplomacy. Global developments since the late 20th century have altered the nature, actors, methods and practices of diplomacy. These changes have their roots in the transformation of the structure of power and authority with the collapse of the bipolar system. Consequently, the centuries-old established diplomatic machine was suddenly confronted with an increase in the numbers of its users and shifts in the functions of the concept itself.

The objective of this article is to discuss the historical evolution of diplomacy through a comparison between pre-Westphalian, Westphalian, and post-Westphalian diplomacy, and to analyze its transformation in the 21st century by focusing on the modifications of four components of diplomacy, i.e. context, rules and norms, channels of communication, and the actors and roles of diplomacy. In exploring this transformation, this article puts forward two arguments. First, diplomacy has become a multi-level and multi-actor network phenomenon in the 21st century. Second, although this transformation has the potential to put an end to the traditional understanding of diplomacy, contrary to expectations, the traces of Westphalian politics and state diplomacy are still substantial.

The Westphalian and Post-Westphalian International Systems

The basis of modern international relations was established by the 1648 Westphalian Peace Treaties, which mark the birth of nation states as the privileged and primary actors, replacing the medieval system of centralized religious authority with a decentralized system of sovereign states as the sole legitimate form of sovereign authority.[1] The Westphalian state-centric system was based on some new principles, including the sovereignty, sovereign independence and equality of the nation states, territorial integrity, the equal rights and obligations of the states, non-intervention in others' domestic affairs, and the conduct of inter-state diplomatic relations through embassies, among many others.[2] Power was at the center of this system to regulate inter-state relations in the absence of any higher systemic authority.

As Michael Vaughan argues, the Westphalian order was important for three reasons.[3] First, it secularized international politics and anchored it on the

tenets of national interests. Second, it introduced the concept of sovereignty and the privileged status of the states without any higher authority standing above them, unless the state voluntarily assents to such an authority. Third, it accepted the states as sovereign supreme authorities within their borders with legitimate authority over all inhabitants living there, and promoted a conception of international society based on the legal equality of the states. Referring to this difference between internal and external sovereignty, domestic politics and foreign policy emerged as two distinct and independent domains for the nation states. Thus, the emergence of similar contrasts, i.e. between national and international, internal politics and foreign policy, world politics and world economics, inside and outside, etc., has become one of the characteristics of the Westphalian system.[4]

States as the basic, principal and sole legitimate actors in the international system continued their privileged status until the late 1980s when state sovereignty and the state-centric Westphalian system had to face the challenges of a newly emerging international order. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the dissolution of the Eastern European communist governments, mostly through the nonviolent revolutions of 1989, transformed the international system by altering not only the rules governing superpower conflict but also the norms underpinning the

> **States as the basic, principal and sole legitimate actors in the international system continued their privileged status until the late 1980s when state sovereignty and the state-centric Westphalian system had to face the challenges of a newly emerging international order.**

international system.[5] Thus, the end of the Cold War symbolized the end of modern international relations and state-centric ideology along with the weakening of the core state-centered tasks. In this respect, the post-Westphalian international system can be conceived within the framework of three constitutive dynamics.

First, sovereignty has been eroding in the globalizing and more cosmopolite world. Nation states have become enmeshed in a complex network of global governance including regional and international organizations, trans-national and sub-national entities, multi-national corporations and non-governmental organizations, citizen movements and individuals that emerged as the independent actors with the assumed capacity to compete with states.[6] Thus,

states can no longer hold exclusive sovereignty and have lost the privilege of being the basic and determining actors of power struggles. Their capacities have been restrained by global dynamics which forced states to share their power and sovereignty with all non-state actors.[7]

Second, the scope of international relations has expanded by reaching to new topic areas. Human rights, gender, women, the environment, democratization, population movements and energy politics, among many others, have been integrated into the field,[8] which is no longer confined to the limits of the nation states, inter-state relations and state-centered tasks and topics.

Third, as Richard Haass argues, "international relations becomes two-pronged: not just state-to-state, but between states on the one hand and sub-national and supra-national actors on the other,"[9] along with its derivative impact on contemporary international diplomacy as state-centered conduct.[10]

Overall, in the post-Westphalian international system, as a result of the fragmentation and transformation of sovereignty, the nature of international relations has changed.[11] Its limits have been extended to embrace power and competition not only between states but also between cultures and civilizations.[12] The international system has become much more interdependent, owing to the emerging partnerships between states and non-state actors. Long-lasting contrasts coupled with the sovereignty principle disappeared suddenly. The difference between internal and external sovereignty has lost its validity. The distinction between domestic politics and foreign policy has become more uncertain than ever. Despite all of these changes, the discourse on the weakening of state power and the disappearance of states in the post-Westphalian system is only rhetorical.[13] States continue to be important in a globalized world, although in a different way. Today, states have to open themselves to non-state actors, which has forced the former to recognize and co-exist with the latter in a multi-level and multi-centered structure.[14] As a result, what happened in practice in the post-Westphalian era is that the conduct of certain activities and practices which were previously under the sovereign authorities of the states now take place through coordination and cooperation among a number of different actors. One of the most obvious areas of cooperation is diplomacy.

Diplomacy

One of the most striking impacts of the systemic and state-level transformation of the post-1989 era has become apparent in the field of diplomacy,

which was traditionally supposed to be a state instrument. In a globalized system, diplomacy and diplomatic practices have transformed, along with modifications in state sovereignty and the sovereignty-based functions of states.

Diplomacy is typically understood as a means of implementing the goals and objectives of the foreign policies of the states. Despite this common understanding about diplomacy, its definition has changed over time, which also proves the evolution and transformation of

> **In a globalized system, diplomacy and diplomatic practices have transformed, along with modifications in state sovereignty and the sovereignty-based functions of states.**

diplomacy. Traditionally, diplomacy has been defined from a state-centric perspective until very recently. One of the leading thinkers in this field, Geoff R. Berridge defines diplomacy as "an essentially political activity and, well-resourced and skillful, a major ingredient of power ... to enable states to secure the objectives of their foreign policies without resort to force, propaganda, or law."[15] In a similar way, Adam Watson defines the concept as a "process of dialogue and negotiations among the states to manage their relations and to reach to their objectives without resorting to force or power."[16] One of the most striking definitions of diplomacy belongs to Sir Harold George Nicolson, who argues that diplomacy is "the management of international relations by negotiation, the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by the ambassadors and envoys, the business or art of the diplomatist."[17] As one of the most symbolic and leading figures on the topic, Henry Kissinger accepts diplomacy as the conduct of relations among states based on compromise rather than on power relations; he argues that the successful and effective implementation of diplomacy is dependent on international law, international institutions and institutionalization.[18] Therefore, it is also important to define diplomacy from an institutional perspective. From this perspective, diplomacy is accepted as a package of rules and routines embedded in the activities, structures and cultures of state institutions as diplomatic actors, which define appropriate behaviors and acceptable norms for the states in their conduct of relations with each other in the international environment.[19]

Referring to the above-mentioned definitions, it is possible to argue that diplomacy has been recognized as a foreign policy tool which emphasizes com-

munication rather than conflict, and compromise rather than competition, to achieve/maintain a peaceful, stable and predictable international system as the eventual objective. In this traditional understanding of diplomacy, diplomatic relations cover relations between states and have been conducted by state diplomats.[20] In line with the traditional interpretation of diplomacy, all diplomatic actors globally share a specific culture, language, operating procedures, norms and standards, and perform similar tasks and duties for their own states. These common characteristics of diplomats make them members of a global trans-national community. Moreover, they have also developed a professional identity shared at the global level by acting within similar institutional frameworks. Consequently, in essence,

> diplomacy has a Janus-faced character with a national side anchored in particular sovereign states and a transnational side anchored in the set of interstate diplomatic principles and rules, trans-national values and identity; trans-nationally shared professional language, norms and behaviors as well as transnationally distributed working methods and standard operating procedures.[21]

The trans-national side of diplomacy was disclosed with the transformation of international relations and the globalization of the international system in the post Westphalian era. Then, the classical definitions of diplomacy became inadequate and were replaced by much more embracing and comprehensive definitions to explain the process of communication in a wider international system. Accordingly, post-Westphalian diplomacy has become a means of global communication and a dialogue mechanism among all systemic actors.[22] The actors conducting diplomacy have proliferated and diversified, as traditional diplomats have been forced to share their diplomatic tasks and duties with others. Diplomatic relations and negotiations have extended greatly by covering relations among all actors, including states, regional and international organizations, civil society actors and international dialog channels.[23] Thus, states and ministries of foreign affairs have lost their exclusivity within the scope of wider diplomatic relations.

As explained by Michael Smith, the changing nature of diplomacy can be acknowledged by referring to three main functions of diplomacy, i.e. representation, communication and negotiation.[24] Accordingly, representation includes such activities as establishing a diplomatic presence in various more

or less institutionalized arenas, and maintaining a focus for the expression of interests or values. Communication includes activities relating to the gathering of information, evaluation and synthesis, and the projection of messages reflecting key interests and values. Negotiation encompasses a spectrum of bargaining and problem-solving activities, and can be carried out in a wide variety of more or less structured arenas. Although these diplomatic functions have been carried out predominantly by the diplomatic services of nation states, in today's globalized system there has been a proliferation of diplomatic and quasi-diplomatic actors that now perform those previously state-based functions of diplomacy.

The Historical Evolution of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is as old as humanity. As a set of practices, rules and procedures enabling regularized interaction and mediation between human collectivities, it has existed since the early days of humankind.[25] However, its form and manner have changed throughout history. It started with early quasi diplomatic practices, continued with traditional diplomacy and evolved into the current global diplomacy.[26] This part of the paper will analyze the history of diplomacy under two categories: traditional state-centric and global multi-actor and multi-level diplomacy.

> **Diplomacy is as old as humanity. As a set of practices, rules and procedures enabling regularized interaction and mediation between human collectivities, it has existed since the early days of humankind.**

Traditional Diplomacy

Traditional diplomacy mostly refers to two different types of diplomacy, i.e. old and new. 'Old' diplomacy includes practices up until World War I. It was to a great extent bilateral and secret, and was conducted by sovereigns themselves or their representatives. 'New' diplomacy emerged with its new style under the League of Nations system. It was relatively open to the public and conducted to a great extent in multilateral settings. New diplomacy was implemented until the 21st century.

The earliest signs of diplomacy can be found in the second, or possible even in the late fourth millennium BCE when sovereigns sent their messengers endowed with a special status to other sovereigns to prevent wars, cease hos-

tilities, or merely to continue peaceful relations and further economic exchanges.[27] In those earliest periods, diplomatic practices depended on some basic principles, including communication through messengers and merchant caravans, diplomatic immunity, ordinary codes of hospitality, and treaty observance by the related parties. However, the diplomatic activities of the early periods remained rudimentary, mainly because of the slow, challenging, unpredictable and insecure nature of communication.[28]

The first examples of more mature diplomatic practices can be found in the correspondence between the Hittites and Ancient Egyptians, which were later developed further by the Greek city states; these paved the way for the institutional basis of diplomacy. It was the Byzantine Empire that, for the first time, developed diplomacy in institutional terms, introduced the status of diplomats/ambassadors, promoted their training and developed protocol rules. [29]

In the Greek city states of the fourth and fifth centuries, conditions became favorable for a more sophisticated diplomacy with the help of a shared language and a largely common inheritance of culture and religion. The first examples of open diplomacy were experienced there.[30] Diplomacy could gain relative transparency owing to informing the public about the processes of negotiations and the signing of treaties. Moreover, diplomatic immunity became a much more established norm and resident missions began to appear, even if they employed local residents (known as proxenos) as different from today.[31] In this sense, the Greek city state system contributed to the development of diplomacy to a great extent.

The Roman Empire did not use diplomacy as a means of maintaining its supremacy, but rather a means of transacting often very routine business. This may be the reason why diplomacy became a method of managing long-distance legal or commercial business, principally within the Empire, which was to constitute its more important legacy.[32] The Empire did not have central institutions for the conduct of foreign policy or the maintenance of records. No records appear to have been kept, and thus no notion at all developed of a continuing diplomatic relationship with any other entity. However, Rome did contribute to diplomacy from the legal perspective through the development of the first basis of a simple diplomatic law, i.e. the *Code of Justinian*.

In medieval Europe, diplomacy was developed first by Byzantium, which used diplomacy as an art of negotiation, and then by Venice, which intro-

duced new standards of honesty and technical proficiency. The former attributed great importance, sometimes primary importance, to diplomacy. The expansion of Byzantine techniques, its immensely long range and its persistence made it a forerunner of the modern system. Moreover, the close relationship with the latter provided a channel of transmission to the Western world.[33] Most of the Byzantium diplomatic system was based on information-gathering and diplomatic initiatives with the desire to avoid war. The system was directed to divide enemies and embroil them with each other, and thus induce them to undertake the fighting which the Empire wished to avoid. The Byzantine Empire used diplomacy more continuously, employed more of its devices and generally used it to play a more central role in imperial policies than had occurred in any preceding society. Byzantine diplomacy was striking and further developed by the Venice, which systemized what it learned from the Byzantine Empire.

Diplomacy reached a much more mature form at the beginning of the 15th century. The Italian city state system of the fifteenth century provided more favorable conditions for the further development of diplomacy. Then, a more

> **Diplomacy reached a much more mature form at the beginning of the 15th century.**

modern and permanent type of diplomacy appeared for the first time.[34] The highly competitive group of small city states, each directly bordering each other, were in constant competition and conflict with each other. Moreover, the repeated invasions of their peninsula by foreigners endangered the security of the Italian states. Continuous diplomacy conducted with little fanfare became the only means to ensure stability among the competing states. Consequently, the ad hoc envoys of the early periods were replaced by resident embassies with broad responsibilities. Thus it became possible to set up permanent and continuous diplomatic contact among units, which resulted in better familiarity with the conditions and personalities in the country concerned and fostered continuous negotiations with them. The practices and methods of the Italian system later evolved into the French system, which appeared as the "first fully-developed system of diplomacy and the basis of the modern diplomatic system."[35]

France led diplomacy in the 17th and 18th centuries, which also witnessed the birth of the nation states and the emergence of a state-centric diplomacy which became one of the exclusive privileges of state sovereignty. The first Ministry for Foreign Affairs wat set up under the French system

by Cardinal Richelieu in 1627. The Ministry was authorized to conduct foreign policy and to use diplomacy as its main tool. Thus, all diplomatic activities were centralized under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and conducted in secrecy and continuity via resident embassies. In the French system, the purpose of diplomatic negotiations was "not to trick the other side but, rather, to reconcile states on the basis of a true estimate of their enduring interests."[36] As different from the earlier diplomacy, in the French diplomatic system, ambassadors acquired higher social standing, and gradually became part of a profession which opened the way for the full professionalization of diplomacy in the 20th century. As a result of this professionalization, diplomats recognized that they had a professional identity as well as professional interests that united them as diplomats. Moreover, the multi-lateral conferences of the French system provided the basis for the emergence of multi-lateral diplomacy and conference diplomacy as one of its examples.[37] With this opportunity, common European problems and concerns became the subject of multilateral diplomatic relations[38] which provided an opportunity for the European states to strengthen and stabilize their relations. This method later became established and institutionalized as a means not only for solving common problems but also for sustaining peaceful relations among states.

The French diplomatic system, "best adapted to the conduct of relations between civilized States,"[39] inspired other European countries. Embassies and delegations became more institutionalized all over Europe, and by the end of the nineteenth century, European-style diplomacy had been adopted throughout the world.[40] Based on the achievements of the French model of the 17th and 18th centuries, the 19th century saw the formalization and professionalization of diplomacy.[41] For the first time, diplomacy was institutionalized and recognized as a profession with its own legal status and specified rules of profession provided by the 1814-15 Vienna Congress as well as the 1899 and 1907 Hague Conferences.[42] In addition, the scope and geography of diplomacy expanded in this period. First, new areas of concern, including human rights and rules of war were included in the focus of diplomacy. Second, as a result of the increasing economic relations of the European states with other continents, European diplomacy extended to non-European territories. The inclusion of non-European states into the existing diplomatic system in the 19th and 20th centuries' foreshadowed the onset of global diplomacy which truly emerged in the 21st century.

In the early 20th century, the French system was modified but not trans-formed. As the number of states increased, the complexity of the problems confronting them multiplied, the urgency attending them grew, and the operating pace of the French system of bilateral diplomacy became too slow. This was realized during World War I and was demonstrated by the rash of conferences – many of them achieving permanent status – that were hur-riedly organized to cope with the crisis. The end of WWI and the establish-ment of the League of Nations opened a new era for international relations in gen-eral and diplomacy in particular. A new diplomacy emerged as the outcome of the new international system which was in-stitutionalized by the League of Nations on the basis of the President Woodrow Wilson's 14 points. Wilson's first prin-

The end of WWI and the establishment of the League of Nations opened a new era for international relations in general and diplomacy in particular.

ciple introduced openness and transparency in diplomatic relations as a reaction to the secrecy of the old diplomacy: "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international un-derstandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view."[43] In the absence of any secret agreements, a new dip-lomatic style emerged to involve the public as fully as possible in the con-duct of diplomatic negotiations and their specific outcomes.[44] Moreover, the League of Nations provided diplomats with the opportunity to sit and discuss the matters or problems of the period openly and in front of all oth-er representatives. With this opportunity, state diplomats representing their states in those conferences also agreed to replace the bilateral alliances of the past with a universal or semi-universal association of states pledged to comply with a set of general principles embodied in international law, and agreed to the abandonment of power politics or the use of force for settling disputes among the states.[45] Thus, post-WWI diplomacy was successfully institutionalized under the League of Nations system. Summit diplomacy as a means of direct communication between heads of states also gained importance in this period.[46]

The onset of the Cold War after World War II closely wedded diplomacy to grand strategy and was often seen as no more than an extension of war by other means.[47] Cold War diplomacy was restricted to direct diplomatic inter-actions not only between the U.S. and the Soviet Union as the two leading powers of the international system but also between/among their bloc coun-

tries, i.e. the Western and Eastern blocs led by the U.S. and the Soviet Union respectively. The United Nations, where the multilateral conferences were institutionalized, became the center of diplomacy through the practices of professional state diplomats in secrecy, mostly behind closed doors. Diplomacy was basically a symbolic indicator of the sovereign power of the states. This diplomatic understanding continued until the end of the Cold War when a new world diplomatic system, so-called global diplomacy, started flourishing as the outcome of the political, social, economic and technological developments of the 21st century.

Global Diplomacy

As emphasized above, diplomacy is one of the last bastions of state sovereignty. However, the impacts of the systemic and state-level transformations of the post-Cold War era have led to radical modifications both of state sovereignty and the sovereignty-based functions of the states. Under those conditions, a new diplomatic style, so-called global diplomacy, emerged as a multi-level and multi-actor phenomenon completely different from traditional diplomatic understanding and practices. Global diplomacy has become a transnational process of social relationship realized by an enlarged diplomatic community.

In the highly complicated and extremely unstable post-Cold War period, diplomacy has become "more complicated, fragmented and global"[48] as a result of the emergence of economic, political, social and cultural relations beyond state boundaries. Global diplomacy involves a different set of diplomatic practices than those of the preceding periods.[49] Very basically, it is accessible to and performed by all systemic actors. Moreover, owing to technological progress in the information and communication sectors, it is practiced by diversified means and methods. As opposed to traditional diplomatic practices, global diplomacy is no longer the exclusive practice of sovereign states, governments or their representatives. Rather, an increasing level of interdependency among all systemic actors at all levels and on all topics has exposed governments to pressures coming from various channels of communication. Thus non-state actors, i.e. international/regional organizations, non-governmental organizations, interest groups, the media, think-tanks, academia, social movements and the public have become involved in the once exclusive territory of diplomats.[50]

In their innovative and creative study, Brian Hocking and others show that the transformation of diplomacy can fully be acknowledged by focusing on four components of diplomacy, i.e. context, rules and norms, communication patterns, and actors and roles.[51] As discussed below, the widening, deepening and accelerating of worldwide interconnectedness is influential in each component of diplomacy, which in turn results in the modification of the entire diplomatic understanding.

First, globalization has challenged diplomatic hierarchy[52] and resulted in the emergence of a poly-centric diplomatic space which is no longer exclusively shared by the ministries for foreign affairs, but also by all other governmental representatives as well as non-governmental organizations, including think-tanks, universities, civil society bodies and media which have emerged as new actors in this space. Thus, the contexts of diplomacy have become more diverse and uncertain in a polycentric diplomatic space. Several patterns of diplomacy have emerged in the form of governmental input, from national policy communications and/or intergovernmental organizations through shared diplomatic arenas reflected in multi-layered and private categories, to loose couplings where government input is low.[53] Moreover, these forms of diplomacy have been forced to co-exist, reflecting multiple spaces of authority and legitimacy, multiple diplomatic sites and domains, the more complex nature of diplomacy, and the diversified diplomatic actors involved. Thus, global diplomacy has become a "trans-national process of social relationship realized by an enlarged diplomatic community."[54]

Second, diplomacy is known as a rule-based practice. The roots of diplomatic rules can be found in two different but interrelated sources, i.e. individual national diplomatic communities and the trans-national diplomatic community. While traditional diplomacy was largely shaped by the former, the transformation of diplomacy has challenged its primacy. The changing nature of diplomacy and the conflicting expectations of the diversified actors of 21st century diplomacy have challenged the sovereignty-based rules of diplomacy. Openness, transparency and accountability have become the guiding principles of global diplomacy.[55]

Third, in the 21st century, technological progress has changed the character of diplomacy, requiring advanced information technologies in modern communication. Today's information circulation and its accessibility have changed the dynamics of diplomatic work, requiring instant practices and faster reactions.

Moreover, the modes of communication have accelerated and diversified with a direct impact on diplomacy. In particular, multi-directional flows of information underpinned by media and social networking have become influential in many areas of state activity, including diplomacy. Thus, the sources of diplomacy and the means of its implementation have proliferated.[56] Technological improvements have also resulted in personal initiatives in diplomacy as a quick and efficient way of dealing with inter-state problems. Progress in communication and transportation has empowered the heads of the governments and ministers of foreign affairs to travel to foreign countries easily and conduct diplomatic relations personally. Consequently, today's diplomatic relations are practiced by politicians as well as professional diplomats.[57]

> **While official diplomats are disposed to building coalitions among states and base their power on political legitimacy, the new diplomatic actors delve into trans-national advocacy networks and base their power on moral legitimacy.**

Fourth, the new international system of the 21st century is characterized by a proliferation of actors and enhanced interdependence among them. Thus, the new diplomatic environment is marked by the recognition of non-state actors not only as consumers of diplomacy but also as producers of diplomacy through diplomatic negotiations. Given the inadequacy of traditional methods for dealing with newly emerging global concerns, it has become a necessity for the ministries of foreign affairs and diplomats to cooperate with other non/governmental institutions and various experts in the field.[58] This cooperation has necessitated acceptance of the role of non-diplomats in diplomatic relations, and the transfer of power from traditional actors to newly-recognized diplomatic actors. In this respect, the emergence of new diplomatic actors along with the traditionally accepted diplomats has forced the latter to share their power with the former and accept changes in their roles.[59] At the same time, the emergence of new actors has influenced the methods of diplomacy. While official diplomats are disposed to building coalitions among states and base their power on political legitimacy, the new diplomatic actors delve into trans-national advocacy networks and base their power on moral legitimacy.[60]

The transformation of these four components of diplomacy has deeply affected diplomacy in the 21st century. However, what has truly changed is the methodology rather than the nature of diplomacy. The traditionally ac-

cepted hierarchical and state-centric diplomatic processes have evolved into a multi-stakeholder and multi-level network system[61] which is much more global, flexible and open. Under these newly emerging conditions, states have recognized the significance of "soft power"[62] in order to achieve their foreign policy aims and objectives. Thus, public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy, as examples of soft power, have appeared as the new diplomatic practices of the 21st century.

Public diplomacy is defined as "efforts by governments to promote their policies and interests abroad by influencing international public opinion through interaction with other polities, forging partnerships with civil societies, and using the media strategically."[63] Another definition of public diplomacy is provided by Paul Sharp who defines it as "the process by which direct relations are pursued with a country's people to advance the interests and extend the values of those being represented."[64] Both definitions emphasize the role of ordinary citizens in achieving the desired outcomes. It has been recognized that the public matters more than before; thus public diplomacy has gained a new prominence in the modern era, even if it has always been practiced as a specific means of diplomatic communication.[65] It also must be noted that despite the growing importance of public diplomacy as one of the roles of modern diplomats, it should only be considered as an additional diplomatic function which complements traditional diplomatic activities. On the other hand, cultural diplomacy, "a national policy designed to support the export of representative samples of that nation's culture in order to further the objectives of foreign policy,"[66] forms an important component of public diplomacy. Cultural diplomacy is also practiced with the intention of influencing the citizens of foreign countries and draws attention to ordinary individuals for the intended foreign policy objectives of the state.

The emergence of individuals and citizens as important actors in the diplomatic practices of the states led to the introduction of a new concept: "Track-Two Diplomacy." The term was first used by Joseph Montville in 1981; he defined it as "unofficial, informal interaction between members of adversary groups or nations that aim to develop strategies, to influence public opinion, organize human and material resources in ways that might help resolve their conflict."[67] Today, track two diplomacy is commonly defined as "methods of diplomacy outside the formal governmental system – the non-governmental, informal, and unofficial contacts and activities between private citizens or groups of individuals aimed at de-es-

calating conflict by reducing anger, fear and tension and by improving communication and understanding."[68] Since its introduction, track two diplomacy has been commonly accepted as a complement to track one diplomacy, which basically refers to the official governmental diplomacy at the state-to-state level. In this context, track two diplomacy is not an alternative but a complement to track one diplomacy.

Overall, although diplomacy has transformed significantly in the 21st century, this transformation does not diminish its significance for states and does not mean that diplomacy is no longer needed. On the contrary, in a highly globalized and inter-connected world, the role of diplomacy has become much more crucial. Even if diplomacy has transformed, its scope and actors have diversified and new rules and methods have emerged in diplomatic relations, governmental diplomacy continues to have a crucial role.[69] States still prefer to use traditional diplomatic methods to resolve problems which directly concern their national interests and securities, while preferring global diplomacy to solve the global problems which concern them all and which they are unable to solve unilaterally.

Conclusion

Since the time of the Westphalia Peace Treaties, which represent a turning point in the history of international relations, diplomacy has been used as a foreign policy tool on the part of states to deal with their common concerns at the systemic level. The institutionalization and professionalization of diplomacy as a state-centric practice continued until the early 1990s, prior to which the states could keep their exclusive sovereignty and enjoy the privileges of being the only diplomatic actors in the international system. The early 1990s, on the other hand, were a period of paradigm changes in the ways in which international relations are conducted. The states have been losing their exclusiveness since then, and have been forced to recognize non-state actors and cooperate with them. More seriously, they have lost their monopoly on sovereignty and their exclusive privileges in some of the symbol areas of their sovereign power. Diplomacy is one of them, and has been moving from a being a tool of national foreign policies to a means of international communication and dialogue.

Since the end of the Cold War, the international system has changed considerably. Along with the systemic changes, diplomacy has also transformed and

become more diversified, multi-dimensional, volatile and intensive. However, what has changed so far is the façade of diplomacy. It seems that the basic functions of diplomacy will remain in demand in managing today's highly complex

Along with the systemic changes, diplomacy has also transformed and become more diversified, multi-dimensional, volatile and intensive.

interactions at the national and global levels. So far, states have been able to adapt themselves to the changing conditions and keep their privilege of being the highest authority in managing the relations among all actors of the international system. As states have managed to maintain their persistency and resiliency, governmental diplomacy has also persevered in an increasingly globalized and interconnected world as a critically important instrument for states to conduct their foreign policies.

Endnotes

1   Gregory A. Raymond, "Westphalia," in Martin Griffiths (ed.), *Encyclopedia of International Relations and Global Politics*, London: Routledge, 2005, p. 856; Daniel Philpot, "Westphalia, Authority, and International Society," *Political Studies*, Vol. 47, No. 3 (1999), p. 578.

2   Stephan D. Krasner, "Compromising Westphalia," *International Security*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (1996), p. 115; Charles W. Kegley and Gregory A. Raymond, *Exorcising The Ghost of Westphalia Building World Order in the New Millennium,* New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2002, p. 132.

3   Michael Vaughan, "After Westphalia, Whither the Nation State, its People and its Governmental Institutions?" *Paper for Presentation at the International Studies Association Asia-Pacific Regional Conferen*ce, 29 September 2011 (Accessed 16 December 2018); Kürşat Kan, "Globalleşmenin Uluslararası İlişkilere Etkisi," *KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Vol. 3, No. 20 (2011), p. 4.

4   Fuat E. Keyman, "Küreselleşme, Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Hegemonya," *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, Vol. 3, No. 9 (2006), p. 5.

5   Rey Koslowski and Friedrich V. Kratochwil, "Understanding Change in International Politics: The Soviet Empire's Demise and the International System," *International Organization,* Vol. 48, No. 2 (1994), p. 215.

6   Kan, "Globalleşmenin Uluslararası İlişkilere Etkisi," p. 6; Jayabrata Sarkar, "Debating a Post-Westphalian International Order," *Mainstream Weekly*, Vol. LIII, No. 15, April 2015 http://www.mainstreamweekly.net/article5577.html (Accessed 15 December 2018).

7   Vaughan, "After Westphalia."

8   Kan, "Globalleşmenin Uluslararası İlişkilere Etkisi," p. 6.

9   Richard N. Haass, "The Politics of Power," *Harvard International Review*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (2005), pp. 61-62.

10 Vaughan, "After Westphalia."

11   Matthew S. Mingus, "Transnationalism and Subnational Paradiplomacy: Are Governance Networks Perforating Sovereignty?" *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 29, No. 8 (2006), p. 587.

12 Keyman, "Küreselleşme, Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Hegemonya," p. 6.

13 Hüseyin Sevim, "Uluslararası İlişkilerde Küreselleşme Olgusu ve Ulus-Devlet Kavramını Yeniden Düşünmek," *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, Vol. 3, No. 9 (2009), p. 116.

14 Keyman, "Küreselleşme, Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Hegemonya," p. 12; Sevim, "Uluslararası İlişkilerde Küreselleşme Olgusu ve Ulus-Devlet Kavramını Yeniden Düşünmek," pp. 92, 104, 114.

15 Geoff R. Berridge, *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, p. 1.

16 Adam Watson, *Diplomacy: The Dialogue between States*, Abingdon: Routledge, 1982, p. xvi.

17 Harold G. Nicolson, *Diplomacy*, London: Oxford University Press, 1942, p. 15.

18 Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.

19 James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*, New York: The Free Press, 1989, p. 160.

20 In the international system, they are still the states – more specifically the Ministries of Foreign Affairs – that use diplomacy most effectively. The embassies and consulates as the representatives of the states in other countries are among the leading diplomatic actors of the states.

21 Jozef Bátora, "Does the European Union Transform the Institution of Diplomacy?" *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (2005), p. 45.

22 Didzis Klavins, "Understanding the Essence of Modern Diplomacy," *The ICD Annual Academic Conference on Cultural Diplomacy 2011: Cultural Diplomacy and International Relations; New Actors; New Initiatives; New Targets,* Berlin, 15-18 December 2011 (Accessed 15 December 2018).

23 Keyman, "Küreselleşme, Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Hegemonya," p. 14.

24 Michael Smith, "The EU as a Diplomatic Actor in the Post-Lisbon era: Robust or Rootless Hybrid," in Joachim A. Koops and Gjovalin Macaj (eds.), *The European Union as a Diplomatic Actor*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, p. 12.

25 Jozef Bátora and Brian Hocking, "Bilateral Diplomacy in the European Union: Towards 'Post-Modern' Patterns?" *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, Clingendael - Netherlands Institute of International Relations, April 2008, https://www.clingendael.org/publication/bilateral-diplomacy-european-union-towards-post-modern-patterns (Accessed 12 December 2018).

26 Deniz Tören, "Diplomasi ve Tarih Boyunca Geçirdiği Evrim," *TUİK Akademi*, 10 October 2011 (Accessed 18 March 2019).

27 Walter R. Roberts, "The Evolution of Diplomacy," *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 3 (2006), p. 55.

28 Berridge, *Diplomacy*, pp. 1-2.

29 Ibid, p. 2; Nicholson, *Diplomacy*, p. 6

30 Keith Hamilton and Richard Langhorne, *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory and Administration*, London and New York: Routledge, 2011, p. 19.

31 Berridge, *Diplomacy*, p. 2; Nicholson, *Diplomacy*, p. 6.

32 Hamilton and Langhorne, *The Practice of Diplomacy,* p. 19

33 Ibid.

34 Yusuf Avar, "Devletler Arası İlişkilerin Gelişimi ve Diplomasi Tarihi", *TUİK Akademi*, 25 November 2016, http://www.tuicakademi.org/devletlerarasi-iliskilerin-gelisimi-diplomasi-tarihi (Accessed 18 March 2019).

35 Berridge, *Diplomacy*, p. 2.

36 Ibid, p. 106.

37 İskit, *Diplomasi*, p. 52.

38 Mehmet Gönlübol, *Milletlerarası Siyasi Teşkilatlanma*, Ankara: Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınevi, 1968, p. 17.

39 Harold G. Nicolson, *The Evolution of Diplomatic Method*, London: Constable, 1954, p. 72.

40 Roberts, "The Evolution of Diplomacy," p. 55.

41 Christer Jöhnsson and Martin Hall, *Essence of Diplomacy*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, pp. 37-38, 69; Watson, *Diplomacy: The Dialogue between States*, p. x.

42 Gönlübol, *Milletlerarası Siyasi Teşkilatlanma*, p. 47.

43 "President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points," 8 January 1918, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/wilson14.asp (Accessed 5 December 2018).

44 Geoff R. Berridge and Alan James, *A Dictionary of Diplomacy*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, p. 193.

45 André Géraud, "Diplomacy, Old and New," *Foreign Affairs*, January 1945, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/1945-01-01/diplomacy-old-and-new (Accessed 7 December 2018).

46 Barış Özdal and Murat Jane, "'La Der Des Ders'in Uluslararası Sistemin Yapısına Etkileri," *Gazi Akademik Bakış*, Vol. 7, No. 14 (2014), pp. 235-238.

47 Hamilton and Langhorne, *The Practice of Diplomacy*, p. 185.

48 Brian White, "Diplomacy," in John Baylis and Steve (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 393.

49 Demet Şefika Acar, "Küreselleşen Dünyada Diplomasi," *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksek Okulu Dergisi*, Vol. 9, No. 1-2 (2006), p. 425.

50 John Robert Kelley, "The New Diplomacy: Evolution of a Revolution," *Diplomacy & Statecraft,* Vol. 21, No. 2 (2010), p. 299.

51 Brian Hocking, Jan Melissen, Shaun Riordan and Paul Sharp, *Futures for Diplomacy - Integrative Diplomacy in the 21ˢᵗ Century*, Clingendael: Netherlands Institute of International Relations, October 2012, pp.12-19 (Accessed 12 December 2018).

52 Iver B. Neumann, "Globalisation and Diplomacy," *Working Paper: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs*, No. 724 (2007).

53 Hocking et al., *Futures for Diplomacy*, pp. 19-23.

54 Klavins, "Understanding the Essence of Modern Diplomacy."

55 Hocking et al., *Futures for Diplomacy*, pp. 31, 23.

56 Neumann, "Globalisation and Diplomacy."

57 Hüner Tuncer, "Eski ve Yeni Diplomasi," *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (1982), p. 253.

58 Ibid, p. 254.

59 Bátora and Hocking, "Bilateral Diplomacy in the European Union;" Bátora, "Does the European Union Transform the Institution of Diplomacy?" p. 50.

60 Kelley, "The New Diplomacy: Evolution of a Revolution," p. 293.

61 Smith, "The EU as a Diplomatic Actor in the Post-Lisbon Era," p. 13.

62 The concept is introduced by Joseph S. Nye as "the ability of a country to persuade others to do what it wants without force or coercion." For details, see Joseph S. Nye, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York: Public Affairs, 2004.

63 Daryl Copeland, *Guerrilla Diplomacy: Rethinking International Relations*, Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2009, p. 9.

64 Paul Sharp, "Revolutionary States, Outlaw Regimes and the Techniques of Public Diplomacy," in Jan Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, p. 106.

65 Geoffrey Allen Pigman, *Contemporary Diplomacy: Representation and Communication in a Globalized World*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010, p. 7.

66 Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht and Mark C. Donfried "The Model of Cultural Diplomacy: Power, Distance and the Promise of Civil Society," in Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht and Mark C. Donfried (eds.), *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy*, New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2010, p. 13.

67 Joseph V. Montville, "The Arrow and the Olive Branch: the Case for Track Two Diplomacy," in John W. McDonald and Diane B. Bendahmane (eds.), *Conflict Resolution: Track Two Diplomacy*, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1987, pp. 5-20.

68 John W. McDonald, "Further Exploration of Track Two Diplomacy," in Louis Kriesberg and Stuart J. Thorson (eds.), *Timing the De-escalation of International Conflicts*, Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1991, p. 202.

69 Shaun Riordan, *The New Diplomacy*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003, p. 130.