

Jerzy Jaskiernia

Jan Kochanowski University (Kielce), Poland

ORCID: 0000-0001-9401-5999

jerzy.jaskiernia@ujk.edu.pl

Parliamentary Diplomacy – A New Dimension of Contemporary Parliamentarism

*Dyplomacja parlamentarna – nowy wymiar współczesnego
parlamentaryzmu*

ABSTRACT

The article analyses the phenomenon of parliamentary diplomacy. Although the international activity of parliamentarians was already observed in the 19th century, it did not gain momentum until the 20th and 21st centuries, becoming an important element of international relations. The author indicates which manifestations of the international activity of parliamentarians deserve the name of parliamentary diplomacy and how this phenomenon, analysed in terms of “paradiplomacy”, influences the modification of the functions of modern parliaments, especially in terms of ensuring democratic control over the creation and implementation of the state’s foreign policy.

Keywords: parliamentarism; diplomacy; international relations; foreign policy; parliamentary diplomacy

INTRODUCTION

The subject of the analysis undertaken in this study is the phenomenon of parliamentary diplomacy. It is observed in the context of the international activity of parliamentarians. This raises the following questions: What is the essence of

CORRESPONDANCE ADDRESS: Jerzy Jaskiernia, PhD, Prof. Dr. Habil., Full Professor, Jan Kochanowski University (Kielce), Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, Department of Constitutional, European and International Public Law, Uniwersytecka 15, 25-406 Kielce, Poland.

parliamentary diplomacy? How can it be defined? What is the legal nature of it? How does it influence the perception of the functions of contemporary parliamentarism? What is its significance in the area of international relations?

The importance of the analysis undertaken here is related to the fact that the area of foreign policy is traditionally subject to less democratic control than the areas of domestic policy, hence the involvement of parliamentarians in this area is of particular importance.¹ The same is true in the field of security and defense, where also ensuring democratic control is, in the light of the experience of political system practice, a serious challenge.² Thus, if we accept as true the thesis of Joseph S. Nye Jr. on the “globalization of the democratic deficit”,³ then parliamentary diplomacy can be seen as a factor in mitigating the “democratic deficit” perceived in the field of world politics.⁴

In this study, the following research hypothesis will be verified: Parliamentary diplomacy has become an identifiable factor in contemporary international relations. Although disputes about its nature persist, there is no doubt that we are dealing here *de minimis* with the phenomenon of “paradiplomacy”. Parliamentary diplomacy does not compete with traditional state diplomacy, but enriches the forms of diplomatic activities with the involvement of parliamentarians with a democratic mandate. This applies to national parliaments, international parliaments as well as international parliamentary assemblies. Parliamentarians bring new value to the conflict resolution and dispute settlement process. They play an important role in the processes of international election monitoring. In this situation, parliamentary diplomacy becomes a factor in reducing the democratic deficit, which is associated with weaker parliamentary control in the sphere of foreign relations and international security.

The following research methods were used in the study: legal and dogmatic, historical and system analysis.

¹ See M. Zürn, *Global Governance and Legitimacy Problems*, “Government and Opposition” 2004, vol. 32(2), p. 261.

² See W. Wagner, *The Democratic Control of Military Power Europe*, “Journal of European Public Policy” 2006, vol. 13(2), p. 214.

³ J.S. Nye Jr., *Globalization's Democratic Deficit: How to Make International Institutions More Accountable*, “Foreign Affairs” 2001, vol. 80(4), p. 2.

⁴ See A. Moravcsik, *Is There a 'Democratic Deficit' in World Politics? A Framework for Analysis*, “Government and Opposition” 2004, vol. 32(2), p. 336.

RESEARCH AND RESULTS

The concept of parliamentary diplomacy – although it is present in the language of politicians and the media since the 1950s – began to be conceptualized only at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries.⁵ It is defined as the full range of international activities undertaken by parliamentarians and parliaments to increase mutual understanding between states, strengthen government accountability and enhance the democratic legitimacy of international organizations.⁶ Although the influence of the parliament in the area of foreign policy has a centuries-old tradition,⁷ “parliamentary diplomacy” is a concept that only in the last three decades began to make its way in the axiology and institutional system of international organizations.⁸ Traditional diplomacy is associated with the activity of the executive authority (president, government, minister of foreign affairs, diplomats), and the introduction of the notation “parliamentary” must raise the question of the legitimacy of such a categorization in the context of understanding the term “diplomacy”.⁹

Some trace the origins of parliamentary diplomacy in ancient times, recalling the activities of the Roman Senate in 205 BCE,¹⁰ although it was undoubtedly a type of activity and not a specific date. The phenomenon of parliamentary diplomacy was written in the context of the Scandinavian “political bloc” in the interwar League of Nations. Ludwik Dembiński referred to the figure of the American diplomat and professor of international law Philip C. Jessup, who in 1956, during a lecture at the Hague Academy of International Law, introduced the term “parliamentary diplomacy” into the dictionary of international law and international relations.¹¹ Jessup in his lecture quoted another American politician and diplomat, the secretary of state in the offices of presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, Dean

⁵ Cf. G. Noulas, *The Role of Parliamentary Diplomacy in Foreign Policy*, “Foreign Policy Journal”, 22.10.2011.

⁶ See S. Stavridis, D. Jančić, *The Rise of Parliamentary Diplomacy in International Politics*, “The Hague Journal of Diplomacy” 2016, vol. 11(2–3), pp. 113–114.

⁷ See J. Black, *Parliament and Foreign Policy 1739–1763*, “Parliaments, Estates and Representation” 1992, vol. 12(2), p. 121.

⁸ See S. Stavridis, D. Jančić, *Introduction: The Rise of Parliamentary Diplomacy in International Politics*, “The Hague Journal of Diplomacy” 2016, vol. 11(2–3), p. 107.

⁹ Cf. G.R. Berridge, L. Lloyd, *The Palgrave Macmillan Dictionary of Diplomacy*, Basingstoke 2012.

¹⁰ See D. Fiott, *On the Value of Parliamentary Diplomacy*, “Madariaga Paper” 2011, vol. 4(7), p. 1.

¹¹ L. Dembiński, *The Modern Law of Diplomacy. External Missions of States and International Organizations*, Dordrecht–Boston–Lancaster 1988, p. 253; P.C. Jessup, *Parliamentary Diplomacy: An Examination of the Legal Quality of the Rules of Procedure of Organs of the United Nations*, “Recueil des Cours” 1956, vol. 89(1), p. 185.

Rusk, who was probably the first to use the term.¹² Julian Sutor, also citing Jessup, explains that the term “parliamentary diplomacy” was used in the past to describe conference diplomacy. This interchangeable use of terminology results from the similarity of conducting debates and negotiations at international conferences to those in parliamentary practice.¹³

By parliamentary diplomacy we should understand the role played by national parliaments, parliamentary assemblies of international institutions, international interparliamentary associations or parliamentarians acting individually as part of international politics. Parliaments often pursue foreign policy that does not necessarily coincide with the foreign policy pursued by the government. Parliamentarians representing national parliaments may act as diplomats on their own behalf during their stay abroad, for example by engaging in talks with representatives of the authorities of the visited country, which is often reported by the media and the authorities of that country. From a formal point of view, public statements by parliamentarians do not bind the country they come from. However, for the public and the authorities of the visited country, there may be a suspicion that a parliamentarian is acting with the consent of his government. This form of foreign activity of parliamentarians can be a kind of “litmus test”, allowing for examining the view or sounding the position on a given issue represented by the authorities of the visited country.¹⁴

Parliamentary diplomacy is a phenomenon that cannot yet be clearly categorized, but it cannot be overlooked either, because it has its practical dimension, involving members of national parliaments in their countries’ foreign policy. Parliamentary diplomacy is certainly not an alternative to classical diplomacy, but going beyond the traditional areas of parliamentary work related to legislation and control of the executive power, it undoubtedly constitutes a good complement to foreign policy and classical diplomacy conducted by the governments of individual countries.¹⁵

Diplomacy *sensu stricto* means diplomacy undertaken by the state (state diplomacy). On the other hand, diplomacy in the broad sense includes both state diplomacy and diplomacy undertaken by other entities active in the sphere of international relations, referred to as “paradiplomacy”. Although the concept of “paradiplomacy” was born in the context of the international activity of the constituent members of federal states, and then was extended to the activity of territorial sub-structures,

¹² See D. Rusk, *Parliamentary Diplomacy – Debate vs. Negotiation*, “World Affairs Interpreter” 1955, vol. 26(2), p. 121.

¹³ See J. Sutor, *Prawo dyplomatyczne i konsularne*, Warszawa 2012, p. 396.

¹⁴ See I. Bochenek, *Dyplomacja parlamentarna jako jeden z instrumentów współczesnych stosunków międzynarodowych*, “Przegląd Sejmowy” 2016, no. 5, p. 239.

¹⁵ See B. Surmacz, A. Kuczyńska-Zonik, *Dyplomacja parlamentarna: uwarunkowania, pojęcie, zadania*, “Policy Papers” 2019, no. 2, p. 14.

including unitary states, it does not seem justified to narrow it down only to this type of entities. For if the term “paradiplomacy” makes sense, it is only when it encompasses phenomena that take place outside the traditional state-led diplomacy.¹⁶

The fact of existence of international parliamentary assemblies naturally gives rise to a tendency for parliamentarians to be active in the sphere of international relations. It usually takes an advisory and controlling form within these organizations, but the tendency for members of international parliamentary assemblies to take initiatives outside the organizations within which they operate is becoming more and more visible. The term “diplomacy” refers to bilateral and multilateral relations between states, but it seems reasonable to notice that elements of such diplomacy are also present in the relations of an international organization with its member states.¹⁷ This may apply to both the “governmental” segment of these organizations and the parliamentary dimension. Thus, in connection with an international organization, it can be said that a “parliamentary foreign policy” is being conducted.¹⁸

In the light of the definition proposed by Gonnée de Boer and Frans Weiglas, parliamentary diplomacy covers the “full range of international action taken by parliamentarians to increase mutual understanding between countries, to assist each other in improving government control and national representation, and to enhance the democratic legitimacy of intergovernmental institutions”.¹⁹

Dean Rusk identified four characteristics of parliamentary diplomacy:

- these are activities included in the broad framework of the continuation of certain interests, not only the implementation of a specific program,
- it is diplomacy open to public debate,
- is conducted on the basis of formalized procedures,
- makes its decisions by voting.²⁰

Philip C. Jessup pointed to the elements distinguishing parliamentary diplomacy from other forms of multilateral negotiations. Firstly, it is a permanent organization whose responsibility and competence extend beyond the agenda of one session. Secondly, they are public and reported by the media. Thirdly, they are implemented on the basis of formalized procedures, according to which one point of view can be accepted and another rejected. The fourth element is the fact that the discussion is closed by a resolution adopted by a majority vote.²¹

¹⁶ See J. Jaskiernia, *Dyplomacja parlamentarna*, Toruń 2022, p. 41.

¹⁷ See F.A.M. Altling von Geusau, *European Organizations and the Foreign Relations of States*, Leyde 1962, p. 56 ff.

¹⁸ P. Fischer, *Europarat und parlamentarische Aussenpolitik*, München 1962, p. 22.

¹⁹ G. de Boer, F. Weiglas, *Parliamentary Diplomacy*, “The Hague Journal of Diplomacy” 2007, vol. 2, pp. 93–94.

²⁰ D. Rusk, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

²¹ See P.C. Jessup, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

Jerzy J. Wiatr highlighted the following differences between parliamentary diplomacy and classical diplomacy: 1) parliamentary diplomacy is undertaken by a wide range of political forces represented in the parliament, while classical diplomacy is undertaken by the ruling majority and reflects its policy (e.g. in the activities of the Parliamentary Union many times there is a split of votes in the national delegation on certain issues, and such a situation is not possible in government diplomacy); 2) parliamentary diplomacy is based on the power of persuasion, especially of a moral nature – so it does not lead to binding decisions; in national, ethnic or religious conflicts, however, such non-binding influence may bring the expected results in the long term; 3) parliamentary diplomacy is undertaken by persons who are not professionally trained in this field, but who draw their knowledge from parliamentary experience; however, parliamentarians use the assistance of professional diplomats in this respect, employed by parliamentary offices; 4) parliamentary diplomacy is undertaken on an *ad hoc* basis, so it does not involve permanent representation abroad; parliamentarians often use the mediation of embassies, but usually take action at interparliamentary conferences; 5) because there is a large rotation in the composition of interparliamentary delegations (especially in new democracies), the phenomenon of discontinuation of activities undertaken in the framework of parliamentary diplomacy has a wide scope.²²

According to Adrian Năstase, we can distinguish three situations where the phenomenon of parliamentary diplomacy occurs: 1) parliamentarians play the role of diplomats, remaining parliamentarians and acting on behalf of their governments or in close cooperation with them (the practice of including parliamentarians in informal diplomatic missions is known in the practice of governments in Western Europe and the United States – they can contribute to breaking the deadlock even without the direct involvement of the government, as was the case with France during the Persian Gulf conflict; the exchange of parliamentary friendship groups can open contacts often impossible at the intergovernmental level; participation of parliamentarians in election observation missions participation of parliamentarians in sessions of the UN General Assembly and important international conferences); 2) “international” parliamentarians, being members of supranational parliamentary assemblies, perform quasi-diplomatic functions, both individually (as assembly rapporteurs) and within groups (committees, specialized subcommittees). Their “diplomatic” role is difficult to establish, as parliamentarians do not appear on behalf of states, and supranational assemblies as a rule do not have the competence to coordinate the foreign policy of the member states of international organizations; 3) international parliamentary organizations are involved in defining the directions of the foreign policy of member states or in criticizing them. Supranational

²² See J.J. Wiatr, *Parliamentary Diplomacy after Cold War*, “Romanian Journal of International Affairs” 1995, vol. 1(5), pp. 99–100.

assemblies do not have the means to enforce such a policy, but practice shows that such recommendations by international parliamentary organizations are taken into account by governments, even if they do not admit it.²³

Rita Süßmuth wondered whether in the case of the concept of parliamentary diplomacy we are dealing with a euphemism or even an adversarial nature of terms. If we define diplomacy as representing the interests of the state abroad, this function may be better performed by professional diplomats than by parliamentarians. However, parliamentary diplomacy and diplomacy are not mutually exclusive and may be treated complementarily. Parliamentary diplomacy can open channels of communication and build bridges of international understanding that official diplomacy is unable or unwilling to open. Parliamentarians can therefore “break the ice” or “open the door”. International conflicts can be more effectively resolved when intergovernmental and interparliamentary activities are related in a coherent and meaningful way.²⁴

On the one hand, parliamentary diplomacy resembles to some extent classical diplomacy (participation in negotiations, seeking conflict resolution methods, mediation, etc.), and on the other hand, it has certain specific features. It is essential that it is undertaken not by government representatives and professional diplomats, but by the nation’s mandates sitting in international parliamentary assemblies. Thus, it is an element of the realization of the functions of these assemblies, even if this factor is not always exposed in the classifications of their functions. Therefore, parliamentarians engage their authority in solving internal and international conflicts, and a particularly important instrument of conduct is dialogue with parliamentarians from the respective countries. This, then, is the basis of the “parliamentary dimension” of international relations, where the executive does not replace the executive, but supplements the activities it undertakes in the field of diplomacy.

The restrictive definition of parliamentary diplomacy distinguishes diplomatic activities within the main international organizations taking place in arenas resembling parliamentary assemblies (UN, UNESCO). It describes diplomatic activities in the form of activities of parliamentary bodies and structures such as parliamentary friendship groups. A broader definition links the modes of operation of parliamentary assemblies and international relations, where the state’s diplomatic activity covers the parliamentary procedure and may be supplemented by more detailed activities. In many countries, the minister of foreign affairs or the minister of defense may be called upon to appear before *ad hoc* parliamentary committees; parliamentary delegations to other countries may submit reports to the executive branch. These

²³ See A. Năstase, *The Role of Parliamentary Diplomacy in Shaping a Sustainable Democratic Security Order*, “Romanian Journal of International Affairs” 1995, vol. 1(5), pp. 10–11.

²⁴ See R. Süßmuth, *The Role of Parliamentary Diplomacy in the Development of a Lasting Democratic Security Order*, “Romanian Journal of International Affairs” 1995, vol. 1(5), pp. 89–90.

instruments (hearings, delegations) are the link between internal policy (the main area of parliamentary activity) and foreign policy. In doing so, a distinction should be made between formal and informal processes.²⁵

Parliamentary diplomacy allows for the creation of a transnational network for parliamentarians to obtain information in the field of foreign and defense policy, including as a result of participation in missions, which enables the flow of information across borders and lines of political divisions, and, as a consequence, enables parliamentarians to exercise more effective control of this area of state policy.²⁶

We are dealing with an increase in the phenomenon of parliamentary diplomacy in the period after the end of the “Cold War”. The barriers, especially of a political nature, which hindered interparliamentary cooperation between parliamentarians from both sides of the Iron Curtain, have been eliminated. It was also possible to combine parliamentary diplomacy with political diplomacy, possible within the framework of pluralistic political systems.²⁷

By undertaking parliamentary diplomacy, members of national parliaments may, in the forum of supranational parliamentary assemblies, influence the shaping of international relations and solve civilization challenges on a global and regional scale, but also promote the state’s interests on the international arena.²⁸ This opens the basis for building the democratic dimension of international relations, essential for the legitimacy of decisions made in this area.²⁹

The activity of parliamentarians in international organizations is one of the reasons for building the democracy of the international system.³⁰ It is also indicated that the increase in the participation of people and social groups in international relations means that “an important issue for state and international institutions is to ensure their democratic participation”.³¹

²⁵ See *Parliamentary Diplomacy: Recent Developments and New Trends*, [in:] *Parliamentary Diplomacy in the ASEAN Context*, Phnom Penh 2020, p. 42.

²⁶ See D. Peters, W. Wagner, C. Glahn, *Parliamentary Control of CSDP: The Case of the EU’s Fight against Piracy off the Somali Coast*, “European Security” 2014, vol. 23(4), p. 446.

²⁷ See F. Rădulescu Botica, V. Duculescu, *Parliamentary Diplomacy and the Promotion of National Values*, “Romanian Journal of International Affairs” 1995, vol. 1(3), p. 105.

²⁸ Cf. *Nationales Interesse und integrative Politik in transnationalen parlamentarischen Versammlungen*, eds. E. Kuper, U. Jun, Opladen 1997.

²⁹ See S. Marschall, *Transnationale Repräsentation in Parlamentarischen Versammlungen: Demokratie und Parlamentarismus jenseits des Nationalstaates*, Baden-Baden 2005, p. 34.

³⁰ See S. Sałajczyk, *Demokracja a postępowanie państwa w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, [in:] *Państwo we współczesnych stosunkach międzynarodowych*, eds. E. Halizak, I. Popiuk-Rysińska, Warszawa 1995, p. 31.

³¹ E. Halizak, *Demokratyczność systemu międzynarodowego?*, [in:] *Państwo – demokracja – samorząd. Księga jubileuszowa na sześćdziesięciopięciolecie Profesora Eugeniusza Zielińskiego*, ed. T. Mołdawa, Warszawa 1999, p. 360.

Parliamentary diplomacy can also be viewed in the context of the legitimacy of policies conducted not by states but by other international entities.³² While international governance can improve the legitimacy of its policies by creating better outcomes, it reduces the legitimacy of the input side as decisions are made away from citizens. International parliamentary assemblies can give legitimacy to decision-making outside the state. Meanwhile, Transnational Parliamentary Assemblies (TPAs) can increase the legitimacy of the international governance process.³³

Parliamentary diplomacy covers various forms of parliamentary activity in the international arena: foreign visits of parliamentary delegations; receiving visits of parliamentarians from other countries, as well as courtesy visits of the highest representatives of other countries (heads of state, prime ministers, ministers of foreign affairs) and ambassadors accredited in a given country; participation of parliamentarians in the work of parliamentary assemblies of international organizations; organization of bilateral and multilateral parliamentary meetings; organization and activities of bilateral parliamentary friendship groups.³⁴ A special dimension of parliamentary diplomacy relates to parliamentary procedures for the recognition of states.³⁵

Parliamentary diplomacy is noticed in the activities of members of national parliaments, international parliaments, and international parliamentary assemblies. It occurs both in organizations with a universal range (e.g. the UN³⁶) and in organizations with a regional or subregional range. This idea was developed by Heinrich Klebes on the basis of the experience of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, in which he was the secretary general for many years.³⁷ The concept of parliamentary diplomacy is also used in a broader European context, taking into account the Council of Europe, the European Union, as well as other international organizations that create a forum for parliamentarians' activity, but also in the scale of global governance.³⁸

³² See H. Abromeit, *Democracy in Europe: Legitimising Politics in a Non-State Polity*, New York 1998, p. 34.

³³ See C. Kraft-Kasack, *Transnational Parliamentary Assemblies: A Remedy for the Democratic Deficit of International Governance?*, "West European Politics" 2008, vol. 31(3), p. 534.

³⁴ See S. Stavridis, *Parliamentary Diplomacy: Some Preliminary Findings*, Jean Monnet Working Papers in Comparative and International Politics, November 2002, no. 48, p. 8.

³⁵ See C. Loda, J. Doyle, E. Newman, G. Visoka, *Parliamentary Recognition*, [in:] *Routledge Handbook of State Recognition*, eds. G. Visoka, J. Doyle, E. Newman, London 2020, p. 256.

³⁶ See K.W. Thompson, *The New Diplomacy and the Quest for Peace*, "International Organization" 1965, vol. 31(3), p. 406.

³⁷ See H. Klebes, *Le Rôle de la Diplomatie Parlementaire à l'Exemple de l'Assemblée Parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe*, "Romanian Journal of International Affairs" 1995, vol. 1(3), pp. 35–36.

³⁸ Cf. *Parliamentary Diplomacy in European and Global Governance*, eds. S. Stavridis, D. Jančić, Leiden 2017.

The resolution of the Second World Conference of Speakers of Parliaments held on 7–9 September 2005 at the UN headquarters in New York stated: “We emphasize that parliaments must be active in international affairs not only through interparliamentary cooperation and parliamentary diplomacy, but also by participating in and monitoring international negotiations, overseeing and enforcing what has been adopted by governments, and ensuring compliance with national standards and the rule of law. Likewise, parliament must be more vigilant in scrutinizing the activities of international organizations and contributing to their deliberations”.³⁹

There was a tendency to include parliamentarians in state delegations undertaking international negotiations. This has, for example, been noted in relation to the review conferences on non-proliferation treaties. It is pointed out that such a procedure is often associated with the intention to weaken the voices against these solutions contained in these international documents.⁴⁰

One of the important goals of parliamentary diplomacy is to ensure democratic control in the spheres of foreign affairs, security and defense, which by their nature are subject to weaker parliamentary control than other areas of state activity, and this results, inter alia, from the secret or confidential nature of actions taken by state authorities in both bilateral and multilateral relations.⁴¹

The existing literature has identified a number of functions for parliamentarians on world affairs: the legitimacy of multi-level governance, democratic control of public policies, “international moral tribunals” or parliamentary diplomacy tout court.⁴²

Geert Jan Hamilton, Secretary General of the Senate of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, speaking in the conference of the Association of Secretaries-General of Parliaments in Quebec on 22 October 2012, in the paper entitled “Parliamentary Diplomacy: Diplomacy with the Democratic Mandate”, he listed a few examples of the advantages and benefits of diplomacy parliamentary. Parliamentary diplomacy serves as a forum for equalizing and alleviating misunderstandings, thereby enriching and stimulating traditional forms of diplomacy. Using the power of parliamentary contacts, it promotes an international democratic legal order. With the legitimacy of democratic representatives, parliamentarians have the right to a credible exchange of positions. By shaping and building the democratic institutions of political, intercultural and interreligious dialogue, they thus protect pluralism.

³⁹ See *Second World Conference of the Speakers of Parliaments, New York, 7–9 September 2005*, Geneva 2006, p. 13.

⁴⁰ See M. Onderco, *Parliamentarians in Government Delegations: An Old Question Still Not Answered*, “Cooperation and Conflict” 2018, vol. 40(3), p. 415.

⁴¹ See G. Bono, *Challenges of Democratic Oversight of Security Policies*, “European Security” 2006, vol. 15(4), p. 434.

⁴² See A. Cofelice, S. Stavridis, *Mapping the Proliferation of Parliamentary Actors in the Mediterranean: Facilitating or Hindering Cooperation*, Instituto Affari Internazionali Working Papers no. 17, Rome 2017, p. 4.

Personal contacts of members of parliaments from different countries increase mutual understanding and have a positive effect on bilateral relations between states. Each such contact can be used in the national context, and can also be the basis for initiating certain relationships relating to peace, security, strengthening democracy and human rights, economic development, as well as education and social affairs.⁴³

In some cases, parliamentarians contributed to the resolution of the conflict in their own country by acting as mediators between the central government and rebel groups. Successful examples of parliamentary mediation in internal conflicts include the Aceh Peace Process in Indonesia as well as the Chittagong Hill Tracts Agreement in Bangladesh.⁴⁴ Regarding indirect types of involvement in conflict resolution, national parliaments can contribute to this by conflict resolution and international crisis management by fulfilling their standard responsibilities, e.g. as endorsing or contributing to government (foreign) policy and participating in International Parliamentary Institutions (IPI).⁴⁵

The importance of parliamentary diplomacy in shaping the state's foreign policy is growing as a result of the increased role of international organizations. There is a reason it can be said that parliamentary diplomacy has become an effective element in formulating contemporary international relations and taking initiatives. The international contacts of parliaments and parliamentarians can also be considered as another diplomatic "track" that complements and supports the efforts of national governments to promote cooperation and understanding. Parliamentary contacts have the particular advantage that they are not restricted by diplomatic procedures and have more freedom in discussions.

There is ample evidence that parliamentary assemblies and parliamentarians act in international affairs as autonomous actors, initiators, path breakers, agenda makers and actors on their own initiative. Therefore, this development confirms the departure from diplomacy perceived as the domain of state organs to one that involves many actors, including parliamentary ones. The main features of parliamentary diplomacy are: flexibility, informality, many levels (from local to global) and many actors (parliamentarians cooperate not only with their counterparts, but also with other persons and entities on world affairs). Parliamentary diplomacy is complementary to traditional state diplomacy. The parliamentary diplomacy

⁴³ See ASPG Quebec Meeting, <https://www.asgp.co/latest-news?page=1> (access: 29.4.2022).

⁴⁴ See United Nations Development Programme, *Parliaments, Crisis Prevention and Recovery: Guidelines for the International Community*, New York 2006, p. 7.

⁴⁵ See T. Tiilikainen, *Toward an Active Participation in Foreign Policy – the Role of the Finnish Parliament in International Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management*, [in:] *Parliaments as Peace-builders in Conflict-Affected Countries*, eds. M. O'Brien, R. Stapelhurst, N. Johnston, Washington 2008, p. 218.

dimension is more evident when it exists between two democratic states or in organizations that act as “democracy clubs”.⁴⁶

The practice of parliamentary diplomacy is a useful instrument for coordinating activities in the field of foreign policy, and it concerns both national parliaments, international parliaments (including the European Parliament) and international parliamentary assemblies.⁴⁷

The use of the term “parliamentary diplomacy” may be critically viewed by those who are ready to associate the concept of diplomacy with its classical dimension and are not inclined to mix categories. They may suggest that it is more about a quasi-diplomatic activity, i.e. one that only bears some features of diplomacy, but cannot be equated with it. Undoubtedly, we are not dealing here with a category that would find a solid juridical basis on the basis of public international law. At the same time, it goes beyond the functions of parliamentarians provided for in constitutional law. It is therefore a phenomenon that brought about the development of international relations, and which cannot be clearly categorized. At the same time, it would be a mistake not to notice this phenomenon. After all, it has a practical dimension and its effects can be measured in relation to the individual levels where parliamentary diplomacy takes place. *De minimis*, the point is not to disregard the potential contribution of parliamentarians when looking for various ways of resolving conflicts that occur in contemporary international relations.⁴⁸ This sphere of state activity cannot be taken out of the public eye, as it determines the development of trust in the policy pursued in this field.⁴⁹

Hubert Vedrine, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1997–2002, speaking at the conference on parliamentary diplomacy organized on 23 May 2001 in Paris by the National Assembly and the Senate, stated that to use the term “parliamentary diplomacy” is like trying to talk about the legislative role of governments or the executive role of parliaments. In the opinion of professional diplomats, a weakness or the disadvantage of foreign parliamentary activity is insufficient coordination actions, and sometimes its lack with representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.⁵⁰ Jean-Louis Debre was also skeptical about the existence of parliamentary diplomacy. Debre, President of the French National Assembly in 2002–2007, in

⁴⁶ See S. Stavridis, *Conclusions: Parliamentary Diplomacy as a Global Phenomenon*, [in:] *Parliamentary Diplomacy...*, p. 369.

⁴⁷ Cf. *Practice of Inter-Parliamentary Coordination in International Politics: The European Union and Beyond*, eds. B.J.J. Crum, J. Fassum, Colchester 2013.

⁴⁸ See J. Jaskiernia, *Dyplomacja parlamentarna jako szczególny typ aktywności członków międzynarodowych zgromadzeń parlamentarnych*, [in:] *Plaszczyzny integracji europejskiej*, eds. A. Dołwiła-Klepcka, Ostrowiec Świętokrzyski 2009, pp. 95–96.

⁴⁹ See D.S. Sayfullaev, *Parliamentary Diplomacy in Making of the Foreign Policy*, “The Advanced Science Journal” 2016, vol. 4(1), p. 52.

⁵⁰ See I. Bochenek, *op. cit.*, p. 237.

his opinion stated: "(...) there is only one diplomacy, that is that of France. She doesn't share; it cannot be separated. It is defined by the President of the Republic and implemented by the government. Parliament exercises its prerogatives in this respect by, for example, ratifying treaties, but does not conduct diplomacy in the common sense of the term".⁵¹ But then Michael Vauzelle, chairman of the Assembly's Foreign Affairs Committee National of France in 1989–1992, said: "(...) if modern diplomacy it is connected with the necessity of quick action and discretion, which is a privilege executive power, it becomes at the same time dependent on the ever-growing needs understanding, dialogue, reflection, development of new ideas, strengthening interpersonal relations. Parliaments are best placed to respond to these needs. There is so today is a place for 'parliamentary diplomacy'".⁵²

An important factor in parliamentary diplomacy is also the fact that parliamentarians represent various political groups, be it in national parliaments or in international parliaments and international assemblies. Through the appropriate selection of delegations (e.g. those who observe elections or mediate opposing political forces) or rapporteurs (in the accession or monitoring procedure), not only is the value of pluralism achieved, but a channel of influence on environments that remain in opposition and are not ready for engaging in dialogue through government structures. It is also about ensuring the most objective and balanced approach, because only under this assumption, mediation activities undertaken as part of parliamentary diplomacy can contribute to resolving the most complex international conflicts.

The main advantage of parliamentarians is the fact that they have the mandate of their societies, which gives the appropriate moral tone to the initiatives undertaken. Therefore, they act on behalf of their nations, striving to achieve the peaceful development of states and societies.⁵³ They are ready to articulate their views more principally than government officials and professional diplomats are used to. They also more often decide to reveal cases of human rights violations, illegal activities, acts of discrimination, etc., than the representatives of the executive power, constrained by diplomatic conventions and fear of retaliation by the criticized states, are ready to do so.⁵⁴ Parliamentarians play an important role in monitoring the conduct of elections in the member states of international organizations, where the use of

⁵¹ See Assemblée nationale, *Les activités internationales de l'Assemblée nationale*, Service des affaires internationales et de défense, Paris 2007, p. 10.

⁵² *Ibidem*.

⁵³ See M.M. Martin Martinez, *National Sovereignty and International Organizations*, The Hague 1996, p. 67.

⁵⁴ J. Drohla, *External Aspects of Human Rights Protection: The Role of the EU, the Council of Europe and the OSCE*, [in:] *Human Rights and the Rule of Law*, eds. R. Alleweldt, P. Dimitrova, J. Drohla, T. Milej, Kraków 2004, p. 161.

confidential diplomacy mechanisms often becomes indispensable in the process of formulating assessments of the democratic nature of elections.

However, there are also some risks associated with parliamentary diplomacy. The principled nature of the courts and the openness of critical appraisals towards the opposing parties may sometimes complicate the process of reaching an agreement, or even exacerbate the conflict. Among the factors weakening the possibility of undertaking parliamentary diplomacy within the framework of the IPI, one should point out the conflicting national or ideological interests among the members of the IPI, which inevitably limit their ability to intervene in global matters. Moreover, parliamentary actors tend to have limited access to the range of resources at the disposal of governments (finance, intelligence, expertise). Other constraints faced by the IPI include the discontinuity of their membership, the sporadic nature of their activities and the duplication of regional parliamentary organizations.

CONCLUSIONS

In the light of the analysis, it can be unequivocally stated that the adopted research hypothesis has been positively verified. Although the assessment of the effects of the occurrence of parliamentary diplomacy is not unequivocal, there is no doubt that it has become a recognizable factor in international relations, enriching state diplomacy and bringing new value to the process of achieving diplomatic goals. This applies to the activity of members of national parliaments, international parliaments, and international parliamentary assemblies.

The development of parliamentary diplomacy has contributed to limiting the phenomenon of the democratic deficit, which occurs in the sphere of parliamentary control of the foreign and security policy area, which cannot be ignored in contemporary analyzes of the division of powers in political systems. Thus, it has become a factor modifying the traditional view of the functions of the parliament in the modern era.

Confidential diplomacy mechanisms in particular become indispensable when parliamentarians assess the degree of democracy of elections as part of international observation missions. They make themselves felt during parliamentary activities aimed at resolving tensions and conflicts.

Undoubtedly, parliamentary diplomacy cannot be treated as a legitimate alternative to state diplomacy. It can, however, be legitimately perceived, in terms of “paradiplomacy”, as a supplementary factor, the use of which finds particular justification wherever classical diplomacy methods have proved insufficient.

REFERENCES

- Abromeit H., *Democracy in Europe: Legitimising Politics in a Non-State Polity*, New York 1998.
- Alting von Geusau F.A.M., *European Organizations and the Foreign Relations of States*, Leyde 1962.
- Assemblée nationale, *Les activités internationales de l'Assemblée nationale*, Service des affaires internationales et de défense, Paris 2007.
- Berridge G.R., Lloyd L., *The Palgrave Macmillan Dictionary of Diplomacy*, Basingstoke 2012, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137017611_2.
- Black J., *Parliament and Foreign Policy 1739–1763*, “Parliaments, Estates and Representation” 1992, vol. 12(2), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02606755.1992.9525819>.
- Bochenek I., *Dyplomacja parlamentarna jako jeden z instrumentów współczesnych stosunków międzynarodowych*, “Przegląd Sejmowy” 2016, no. 5.
- Boer G. de, Weiglas F., *Parliamentary Diplomacy*, “The Hague Journal of Diplomacy” 2007, vol. 2, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/187119007X180494>.
- Bono G., *Challenges of Democratic Oversight of Security Policies*, “European Security” 2006, vol. 15(4), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662830701306037>.
- Cofelice A., Stavridis S., *Mapping the Proliferation of Parliamentary Actors in the Mediterranean: Facilitating or Hindering Cooperation*, Instituto Affari Internazionali Working Papers no. 17, Rome 2017.
- Crum B.J.J., Fassum J. (eds.), *Practice of Inter-Parliamentary Coordination in International Politics: The European Union and Beyond*, Colchester 2013.
- Dembinski L., *The Modern Law of Diplomacy. External Missions of States and International Organizations*, Dordrecht–Boston–Lancaster 1988.
- Drohla J., *External Aspects of Human Rights Protection: The Role of the EU, the Council of Europe and the OSCE*, [in:] *Human Rights and the Rule of Law*, eds. R. Alleweldt, P. Dimitrova, J. Drohla, T. Milej, Kraków 2004.
- Fiott D., *On the Value of Parliamentary Diplomacy*, “Madariaga Paper” 2011, vol. 4(7).
- Fischer P., *Europarat und parlamentarische Aussenpolitik*, München 1962.
- Götz N., *On the Origin of ‘Parliamentary Diplomacy’ Scandinavian ‘Bloc Politics’ and Delegation Policy in the League of Nations*, “Cooperation and Conflict” 2005, vol. 40(3), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836705055066>.
- Halizak E., *Demokratyczność systemu międzynarodowego?*, [in:] *Państwo – demokracja – samorząd. Księga jubileuszowa na sześćdziesięciopięciolecie Profesora Eugeniusza Zielińskiego*, ed. T. Mołdawa, Warszawa 1999.
- Jaskiernia J., *Dyplomacja parlamentarna*, Toruń 2022.
- Jaskiernia J., *Dyplomacja parlamentarna jako szczególny typ aktywności członków międzynarodowych zgromadzeń parlamentarnych*, [in:] *Plaszczyzny integracji europejskiej*, eds. A. Doliwa-Klepaczka, Ostrowiec Świętokrzyski 2009.
- Jessup P.C., *Parliamentary Diplomacy: An Examination of the Legal Quality of the Rules of Procedure of Organs of the United Nations*, “Recueil des Cours” 1956, vol. 89(1).
- Klebes H., *Le Rôle de la Diplomatie Parlementaire à l'Exemple de l'Assemblée Parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe*, “Romanian Journal of International Affairs” 1995, vol. 1(3).
- Kraft-Kasack C., *Transnational Parliamentary Assemblies: A Remedy for the Democratic Deficit of International Governance?*, “West European Politics” 2008, vol. 31(3), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402380801939818>.
- Kuper E., Jun U. (eds.), *Nationales Interesse und integrative Politik in transnationalen parlamentarischen Versammlungen*, Opladen 1997, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-663-10878-8>.
- Loda C., Doyle J., Newman E., Visoka G., *Parliamentary Recognition*, [in:] *Routledge Handbook of State Recognition*, eds. G. Visoka, J. Doyle, E. Newman, London 2020, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351131759-20>.

- Marschall S., *Transnationale Repräsentation in Parlamentarischen Versammlungen: Demokratie und Parlamentarismus jenseits des Nationalstaates*, Baden-Baden 2005.
- Martin Martinez M.M., *National Sovereignty and International Organizations*, The Hague 1996.
- Moravcsik A., *Is There a 'Democratic Deficit' in World Politics? A Framework for Analysis*, "Government and Opposition" 2004, vol. 32(2), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-7053.2004.00126.x>.
- Năstase A., *The Role of Parliamentary Diplomacy in Shaping a Sustainable Democratic Security Order*, "Romanian Journal of International Affairs" 1995, vol. 1(5).
- Noulas G., *The Role of Parliamentary Diplomacy in Foreign Policy*, "Foreign Policy Journal", 22.10.2011.
- Nye Jr. J.S., *Globalization's Democratic Deficit: How to Make International Institutions More Accountable*, "Foreign Affairs" 2001, vol. 80(4), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/20050221>.
- Onderco M., *Parliamentarians in Government Delegations: An Old Question Still Not Answered*, "Cooperation and Conflict" 2018, vol. 40(3), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836717737571>.
- Parliamentary Diplomacy: Recent Developments and New Trends*, [in:] *Parliamentary Diplomacy in the ASEAN Context*, Phnom Penh 2020.
- Peters D., Wagner W., Glahn C., *Parliamentary Control of CSDP: The Case of the EU's Fight against Piracy off the Somali Coast*, "European Security" 2014, vol. 23(4), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2014.896341>.
- Rădulescu Botica F., Duculescu V., *Parliamentary Diplomacy and the Promotion of National Values*, "Romanian Journal of International Affairs" 1995, vol. 1(3).
- Rusk D., *Parliamentary Diplomacy – Debate vs. Negotiation*, "World Affairs Interpreter" 1955, vol. 26(2).
- Sałańczyk S., *Demokracja a postępowanie państwa w stosunkach międzynarodowych*, [in:] *Państwo we współczesnych stosunkach międzynarodowych*, eds. E. Haliżak, I. Popiuk-Rysińska, Warszawa 1995.
- Sayfullaev D.S., *Parliamentary Diplomacy in Making of the Foreign Policy*, "The Advanced Science Journal" 2016, vol. 4(1), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15550/ASJ.2016.01.052>.
- Second World Conference of the Speakers of Parliaments, New York, 7–9 September 2005*, Geneva 2006.
- Stavridis S., *Conclusions: Parliamentary Diplomacy as a Global Phenomenon*, [in:] *Parliamentary Diplomacy in European and Global Governance*, eds. S. Stavridis, D. Jančić, Leiden 2017.
- Stavridis S., *Parliamentary Diplomacy: Some Preliminary Findings*, Jean Monnet Working Papers in Comparative and International Politics, November 2002, no. 48.
- Stavridis S., Jančić D., *Introduction: The Rise of Parliamentary Diplomacy in International Politics*, "The Hague Journal of Diplomacy" 2016, vol. 11(2–3), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-12341344>.
- Stavridis S., Jančić D., *The Rise of Parliamentary Diplomacy in International Politics*, "The Hague Journal of Diplomacy" 2016, vol. 11(2–3), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-12341344>.
- Stavridis S., Jančić D. (eds.), *Parliamentary Diplomacy in European and Global Governance*, Leiden 2017, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004336346>.
- Surmacz B., Kuczyńska-Zonik A., *Dyplomacja parlamentarna: uwarunkowania, pojęcie, zadania*, "Policy Papers" 2019, no. 2.
- Sutor J., *Prawo dyplomatyczne i konsularne*, Warszawa 2012.
- Süssmuth R., *The Role of Parliamentary Diplomacy in the Development of a Lasting Democratic Security Order*, "Romanian Journal of International Affairs" 1995, vol. 1(5).
- Thompson K.W., *The New Diplomacy and the Quest for Peace*, "International Organization" 1965, vol. 31(3), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300012364>.

- Tiilikainen T., *Toward an Active Participation in Foreign Policy – the Role of the Finnish Parliament in International Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management*, [in:] *Parliaments as Peacebuilders in Conflict-Affected Countries*, eds. M. O'Brien, R. Stapehurst, N. Johnston, Washington 2008.
- United Nations Development Programme, *Parliaments, Crisis Prevention and Recovery: Guidelines for the International Community*, New York 2006.
- Wagner W., *The Democratic Control of Military Power Europe*, "Journal of European Public Policy" 2006, vol. 13(2), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501760500451626>.
- Wiatr J.J., *Parliamentary Diplomacy after Cold War*, "Romanian Journal of International Affairs" 1995, vol. 1(5).
- Zürn M., *Global Governance and Legitimacy Problems*, "Government and Opposition" 2004, vol. 32(2), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-7053.2004.00123.x>.

ABSTRAKT

W artykule analizie poddane zostało zjawisko dyplomacji parlamentarnej. Choć międzynarodowa aktywność parlamentarzystów obserwowana była już w XIX w., to jednak dopiero w XX i XXI w. nabrała dynamiki, stając się istotnym elementem stosunków międzynarodowych. Autor wskazuje, które przejawy międzynarodowej aktywności parlamentarzystów zasługują na miano dyplomacji parlamentarnej oraz jak zjawisko to, analizowane w kategoriach „paradyplomacji”, oddziałuje na modyfikację funkcji współczesnych parlamentów, zwłaszcza w kwestii zapewnienia demokratycznej kontroli tworzenia i realizacji polityki zagranicznej państwa.

Słowa kluczowe: parlamentarizm; dyplomacja; stosunki międzynarodowe; polityka zagraniczna; dyplomacja parlamentarna