

Sub National Engagement: Shaping India's Foreign Policy Through Para-Diplomacy

Nisha Parmar¹, Dr. Mehal Pandya²

¹Research Scholar, School of International Studies & Diaspora, Gujarat University

²Professor & HOD Department of Maritime Management, B. K. School of Professional & Management Studies, Gujarat University

Abstract

Purpose: This paper tends to discuss the dynamics of paradiplomacy and analyses the impact on foreign relations in India. The present study gives an idea of how states and local governments influence and shape India's foreign policy agenda by analysing how sub-nationalism has been evolving in India.

Design / Method / Approach: This paper undertakes a qualitative historical study based on a range of data and information sources with the view to developing an understanding of India's foreign policy through paradiplomacy.

Originality/Value: This study specifically examines India's unique circumstances and subnational actors' involvement in influencing foreign policy through paradiplomacy. Through a comprehensive examination of the constantly changing dynamics and the influence of states and local governments on India's foreign policy, this study provides fresh perspectives on this relatively unexplored area of India's international relations.

Findings: This study will examine the potential and difficulties associated with paradiplomacy, emphasizing its importance within the context of India's international involvement.

Keywords: paradiplomacy, foreign policy, sub-national diplomacy, India

INTRODUCTION

State governments, or subnational governments, are now potential players in international politics; this phenomenon is known as "para diplomacy." The word "para diplomacy" refers to parallel diplomacy, which refers to how states and their subnational administrations manage overseas relations. The mid-1980s saw the start of this shift, particularly with the release of *Publius* magazine's autumn issue (Alvarez, 2020). The main focus of the issue was on the internationalisation of the non-central governments of the federal States, particularly their intermediate governments. Since then, paradiplomacy research has grown. In recent years, India's global influence and engagement have grown significantly, propelled by its impressive economic performance (Nayar, 2006). While its foreign policy has traditionally emphasised autonomy and self-reliance, the country has increasingly sought to assert its presence on the international stage, driven by both external pressures and domestic aspirations. Sinha and Dorschner (2010). Researchers such as Kuznetsov (2014) and Schiavon (2019) have recently sought to address the theoretical and terminological difficulties that arose from the release of paradiplomacy studies (Alvarez, 2020). India's subnational diplomatic activities have skyrocketed in recent years. The practice of paradiplomacy appears to be a fundamental and developing strategy in India's foreign policy discourse given its enormous

present engagement with the world and the increasing global engagements of Indian state governments. Analysis of paradiplomacy, derived from research on the development of knowledge in the field of international relations, is still slightly nascent. However, several works of literature have endeavoured to address the subject of paradiplomacy in their analysis. An in-depth examination of the literature on paradiplomacy practices is provided in this paper.

Conceptual Framework of Paradiplomacy

The concept of "paradiplomacy" has developed as an innovative paradigm for understanding the role of regional and local governments in global politics since the 1970s. It is relatively new (Balzacq et al., 2020), although scholars often agree on definitions, the emphasis of particular studies can vary. In the 1980s, the idea of "parallel" diplomacy emerged, initially in the writings of I. Duchacek (1986) and P. Soldatos (1990), were pioneering individuals for utilising the term in an academic context. Legislators, bureaucrats, corporate privileged groups, and sub-units of ministries are a few examples of actors outside of central government ministries that have been unexplored in both theory and practice since the 1970s (Keohane & Nye, 1974; Milner, 1997; Slaughter, 2004; Wallander, 2007; Liu, T. & Song, Y. 2020).

- **The evolution of sub-national engagements in foreign affairs**

Paradiplomacy, in its most general form, refers to the actions of subnational authorities in the field of international relations with the aim of safeguarding their interests and establishing their own unique nature. The study of subnational governments' participation in international affairs can be divided into three primary stages. The first part explores the origins of paradiplomacy studies in the 1970s. In reaction to the "new federalism" ideas put out by the Nixon administration in the US and the independence movement in Quebec, paradiplomacy studies emerged in the early 1970s, with an emphasis on North America (Atkey, 1970; Holsti & Levy, 1974; Leach et al., 1973, Liu, T. & Song, Y. 2020). Works during this period focused on explaining how subnational governments assert their global competency. (Kuznetsov, 2014). In 2014, Alexander Kuznetsov was one of the few scholars that systematically organised the current understanding of the concept of 'paradiplomacy'. This term has become an innovative way that explain the involvement of sub-national governments in international affairs. The study examined the determinants behind the increase in paradiplomatic activities, the legal consequences, the primary desires, the process of institutionalisation, the stance of central governments towards the paradiplomacy of their constituent entities, and the effects of paradiplomatic activities on the overall growth of countries. In the 1980s, scholars turned their focus from case studies and descriptive research on paradiplomatic occurrences to exclusively theoretical and terminological contributions. This marked the actual start of phase two of scholarly research on paradiplomacy. The first stage involved searching for a suitable term that could precisely clarify the pattern of subnational governments interacting with the outside world.

- **Definitions of Paradiplomacy**

Academics use "paradiplomacy," an acronym for "parallel diplomacy," to describe this phenomenon (Soldatos, 1990). After looking into the historical context and implications of the term, Iñaki Aguirre (1999) admitted that "paradiplomacy" is "a keyword with mysterious successes in specialised literature, even though its analytical definition is not clear" (p. 185). In his article, the phrase "paradiplomacy" refers to the overseas activities of subnational and provincial administrations in federal and unitary systems, namely in the areas of socio-economics, security, and energy (Aguirre, 1999). When it comes to international affairs, federal and subnational governments typically work together, although their engagement is "more functionally specific and targeted, and often opportunistic and experimental."

(Keating, 1999, p. 4). Several academics raised concerns by proposing alternate interpretations of the phrase, despite its broad usage. An example would be the 1990 definition of "paradiplomacy" by John Kincaid, who noted that the term had its origins in "parallel diplomacy," suggesting that subnational governments' diplomatic efforts were subordinate to those of the federal government. Based on his outcomes, the term "paradiplomacy" ought to be replaced with "constituent diplomacy." (Kincaid, 1990). Instead of considering that subnational diplomacy is obedient to national-level decisions on foreign policy and international relations, the term "constituent diplomacy" describes the core duties that subnational governments establish in this field. The phrase "constituent diplomacy," referring to the actors as different units or governments, further clarifies the original concept, originally known as a paradiplomatic player (Kuznetsov, 2014, p. 29). To describe the foreign policy actions of American states and Canadian provinces, Ivo Duchacek used the word "micro-diplomacy," which is another name for paradiplomacy, in his publications from the 1980s. Panayotis Soldatos later proposed the term "paradiplomacy," which Duchacek (1990) accepted. Duchacek used the concept to argue that national and subnational foreign objectives should be addressed equally (Liu, T. & Song, Y. 2020). Throughout the first two periods, academic interest in centralised studies primarily focused on Western federations. The third stage emerged in the 2000s, which brought with it an array of emerging spots on the "map of paradiplomacy studies." The rising influence of non-Western nations in global politics and the global economy made this outcome conceivable. For example, in 2014, Fritz Nganje examined the role of paradiplomatic actions carried out by the provinces in South Africa to encourage the democratisation of Pretoria's foreign policy (Nganje, 2014).

Paradiplomacy has also been the subject of several studies in Asian contexts over the past decade. (Amitabh Mattoo and Happyman Jacob, 2009). In specific, Malgorzata Pietrasiak et al. (2018) analysed numerous cases of subnational units in China and India, and Falguni Tewari (2016) urged Indian governments to draw lessons from their Chinese counterparts in the field of international relations. The resulting set of resources has greatly enhanced the field of paradiplomatic studies by incorporating empirical evidence from non-Western, particularly Asian, regions into current paradiplomacy concepts (Liu, T. & Song, Y. 2020). Paradiplomacy, as defined by G. Yarovoy, refers to the increasing impact of subnational actors on states' domestic and foreign diplomatic relations (Yarovoy, 2013). The significance of cities in world politics is significant due to their function as the creative centers of emerging technologies and the hubs of global networks that facilitate linkages. In a similar vein, Ivo Duchacek (1984) extensively examined the significance of subnational administrations, which gradually emerged as crucial participants in the steady decline of sovereignty (Duchacek, 1984). According to Jorge Schiavon, who compared paradiplomacy in eleven nations (the US, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Germany, India, Mexico, Russia, South Africa, and the UK), sub-state diplomacy is becoming more important. This takes place as several levels of government at the federal, provincial, city, and regional levels work to foster commerce, investment, collaboration, and partnerships on a wide range of topics (Schiavon, 2019).

Paradiplomacy has several potential applications in foreign policy. The ability of cities and other sub-state entities to supply transnational flows is essential for the states to maintain their standing in the contemporary global economy and politics. Paradiplomacy is one aspect of globalization that manifests itself in cities. One of the best ways for a state to increase its soft power is through paradiplomacy. It aims to enhance trade and investment between countries, as well as political, economic, social, and cultural ties. In some cases, such an attempt results in more cross-border ties between individuals than standard state

initiatives.

Mechanisms of Para-Diplomacy in India

The federal structure of India facilitates a complex relationship between the central government and subnational institutions. Although foreign policy is primarily the exclusive domain of the central government, India's states and Union Territories have been actively pursuing independent engagement with the international world. This phenomenon, referred to as paradiplomacy, has become increasingly significant and relevant, providing a distinctive case study for comprehending subnational diplomacy in a diverse and decentralised nation. In India, paradiplomacy has been around for a while. Historically, many princely kingdoms established diplomatic ties with foreign countries prior to the nation's independence in 1947. However, the process of global economic liberalisation throughout the 1990s is largely responsible for the current development of paradiplomacy. After achieving economic independence, governments began exploring international prospects in order to attract foreign investment and facilitate trade. From an Indian standpoint, paradiplomacy is primarily an economic imperative rather than a consequential diplomatic outcome.

- **Diplomatic Missions by Indian States:**

Paradiplomacy is mainly carried out by Indian states through economic cooperation. It is imperative to acknowledge that the Indian federal structure is centre-centric before delving into the alterations made to the system. In other words, the nominal division of powers gives the Central government immense power, leading to the designation of India as "marginally federal or a quasi-federation" (Hicks & Wright, 1981). With the emergence of minority and coalition governments in 1967, the Indian federal system was under significant pressure due to the introduction of the governor's seat and the increasing importance of state sovereignty (Hazarika, 2014; Tewari, 2017). In the past few years, India's subnational diplomatic efforts have increased dramatically. Early in 2015, one month prior to PM Modi's official visit to China, the Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) requested that Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister Chandrababu Naidu lead a prominent delegation to China in April. (Deccan Chronicle, 2015) In June 2015, Mamata Banerjee, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, accompanied Prime Minister Modi during his official delegation visit to Bangladesh (The Hindu, 2015; Bora, 2024). When Manmohan Singh, India's previous prime minister, visited Bangladesh in September 2011, he did the same thing and brought along four chief ministers from the northeastern states that border Bangladesh. An emerging trend in India's official foreign relations is the inclusion of chief ministers on prime ministerial tours abroad, or the suggestion that a chief minister lead a delegation overseas before a prime ministerial visit (Jain & Maini, 2017). In this case, federalising foreign policy is a crucial component. Globalisation has blown apart the conventional borders, resulting in the emergence of new political, economic, and social forces, necessitating the resources, tools, and assistance of the Union's administration to deal with them. Political participation at the subnational level in international affairs has the capacity to enhance India's stance on significant matters. Undoubtedly, in a country of India's sheer magnitude—a subcontinent, for all practical purposes—it is essential to decentralise the actual implementation of some elements of diplomacy (Tewari, 2016; Bora, 2024). Furthermore, states generally have a superior capacity compared to national governments to engage in diplomatic endeavours in various domains, including business outsourcing, trade, commerce, education, and foreign direct investment (FDI) (Pant, 2016). Paradiplomacy became significantly important as a result of the initiatives taken by regional party governments in states including Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, Orissa, Gujarat, and the pivotal state of Uttar Pradesh. Even unitary neighbours like China and Japan were

leading the way in paradiplomacy during the 1970s, despite the establishment of a favourable climate for it (Jacob, 2016). Either the opposition or regional parties formed coalition governments, which presented significant obstacles for these state governments. The federal administration's partisanship towards these states compelled them to explore alternative development models for their individual states (Jha, 2014). The emergence of subnational paradiplomacy can occur both vertically and horizontally. Undertaking cross-border and inter-subnational trade in a horizontal direction is a new and unique practice for the Indian subnational states. Subnational delegations from foreign states, led by their respective governors or premiers, now frequently visit India's subnational capitals. Indian law prohibits subnational states from establishing trade missions overseas. Accordingly, several countries have wholeheartedly adopted state paradiplomacy as a tool to establish closer ties with other nations, including the USA, Canada, Brazil, Australia, China, Japan, and several others (Jha, 2019, p. 383). The Gujarat government's 2014 commitment to establish autonomous international offices in countries such as the USA, China, and Japan aimed to attract foreign investors to invest in the state. This initiative may make Gujarat the first state to establish such long-term facilities overseas in order to attract foreign direct investment (FDI). In the past, Gujarat government officials would travel to various foreign countries in advance of the Vibrant Gujarat Global Investors Summits. However, after establishing international desks in those nations, the state's efforts to draw in foreign direct investment (FDI) became year-round (The Economic Times, 2014, July 6).

An analysis of the obstacles and constraints in Para diplomacy of India

According to the Indian Constitution, the Central Government alone has the authority to handle matters pertaining to foreign policy. The External Affairs Minister, the bureaucracy inside his ministry (the Ministry of External Affairs), and the Prime Minister and his office are the main entities involved in formulating and carrying out foreign policy. Declaring war, maintaining diplomatic and consular contacts, appointing and receiving diplomats, ratifying and executing treaties, and gaining or relinquishing territory are all under the purview of the Central Government. Moreover, due to the complexity of the matter, a small number of Central Government employees dominated interactions with the outside world (Hall, 2019). In order to guarantee that the federating sub-units had reasonable and restricted autonomy following partition, the Indian Constitution's framers included a strong unitary character in the fundamental law. The Indian Constitution thus anticipated and allowed for a federal structure with a unitary bias. The Indian Constitution anticipated a triple division of legislative powers between the Union and the states (Article 246), reflecting the power differential between the two (Basu, 2020). A clear division of power exists in Indian law between the central government and the states. Article 246 of the Indian Constitution divides the legislative powers of the Centre and the states into three categories. The Union government has the sole authority to legislate in particular areas, including foreign affairs, trade and commerce with foreign countries, import and export, diplomatic, consular, and trade representation, participation in international conferences, and entering into treaties, agreements, and conventions with foreign countries (Tewari 2017 & Pant 2016). The states' participation in paradiplomacy meant that international economic policy was no longer a fundamental prerogative. Economic regionalisation and globalisation have enabled Indian states to engage, if not legally, in de facto interactions with their respective overseas investors (Jha, 2019, p. 381). If India treats foreign policy like a football game, where "regionalists" start calling the shots and dictating the game's location, it could face significant consequences (Bhambhari, 2012). If the Centre allows narrow regional interests to dominate the country, it could result in significant harm to the nation.

Therefore, the use of political paradiplomacy by governments caused adverse reactions. Paradiplomatic practices inspired by nationalism have the potential to seriously harm our national interests. Some policy analysts have claimed that there exist regions and sub-nationalities inside the country that have not yet completely embraced the concept of national unity. Given the conditions, it would be negligent to extend such liberties upon the constituent units (Mattoo & Jacob, 2009, p. 185).

After reviewing approximately 102 research papers, I have divided paradiplomacy into three distinct parts to better understand the external activities of regional governments in India.

Paradiplomacy's significance in India

- **Economic Growth:** Paradiplomacy is important in India because it is used by states and union territories to attract foreign direct investment (FDI) and facilitate trade, thereby contributing to economic growth. State governments have been actively pursuing international enterprises through initiatives like "Make in India," which has contributed to economic growth.
- **Cultural Diplomacy:** Paradiplomacy has actively promoted cultural interchange and interpersonal communication. Education alliances, festivals, and art exhibitions at the subnational level strengthened India's soft power.
- **Sustainable Development:** To address global targets like the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), such as climate change, sustainable urban development, and healthcare, certain governments have established international collaborations.

Challenges in practicing paradiplomacy in India

- **Insufficient clarification:** In some instances, there is an absence of clarification concerning the level of independence that states have in their foreign involvement, resulting in unpredictable clashes with the central government.
- **Unequal distribution of resources:** The existence of resource differences across governments leads to variations in their ability to effectively engage in paradiplomacy, which in turn results in disparities in their interactions with other countries.
- **Coordination Issues:** One of the challenges in paradiplomacy is the coordination of actions across states and with the central government, which might result in fragmented engagement.

Paradiplomacy in India: Prospects and Future Directions

Despite challenges, the prospects for paradiplomacy in India are promising:

- **Institutional Framework:** By developing a well-defined institutional structure to regulate paradiplomacy and establish the specific duties and responsibilities of states and the central government, cooperation can be improved.
- **Capacity Building:** States require assistance in enhancing their ability to participate in international affairs, which includes diplomacy training initiatives and the provision of necessary resources.
- **Global Networks:** States have the ability to use international networks and subnational associations to exchange and implement effective strategies, as well as advance their best interests in the global arena.

The practice of paradiplomacy in India is a continuous and growing phenomenon, driven by the process of economic liberalisation, globalisation, and the aspiration of states and Union Territories to actively participate in the international community. Furthermore, it presents both prospects and obstacles, and its importance goes beyond just economic expansion to include cultural diplomacy and sustainable

development. As India continues to emerge as a prominent global player, we anticipate a heightened significance of paradiplomacy in shaping its international engagement. Hence, it is crucial for India to have a cohesive structure that enables the cooperative cohabitation of central and subnational diplomacy, guaranteeing the efficient representation of the country's shared interests in the global arena.

Conclusion

Certainly, paradiplomacy is a relatively new phenomenon in the realm of international affairs. With the evolution of time and the increasing importance of players in global contacts, sub-states (provinces and cities) now possess significant capacity to engage in international communication with other provinces and cities. The implementation of global collaboration by the provincial and municipal governments will facilitate the region's comprehensive development in alignment with the specific needs of each region. The presence of entities within the province and municipal governments that possess the ability to engage in international cooperation is one of the several matters that require assessment. Provincial and municipal governments must recognize their own capabilities to determine the power that will be used as capital in the practice of paradiplomacy. Currently, India is transitioning from a regional to a global power, and it has a dynamic foreign policy in place to support this. In recent years, Indian states have increased their involvement in establishing sub-regional projects and improved their understanding of the agenda for regional cooperation compared to a few years ago. After the implementation of economic reforms, Indian states have been crucial in shaping India's foreign policy decision-making in two key domains: economic diplomacy and shaping the country's relations with its surrounding republics. Given India's growing importance in the international arena, it is essential that Indian states maintain a greater role in the country's foreign policy decisions. However, the Indian Constitution deeply embedded the concept of a powerful central government, maintaining its sole authority over foreign policy initiatives. No legal framework exists to encourage the Indian states' participation in formulating foreign policies. State governments often take action as needed, driven by coalition initiatives or powerful state officials. The present study examines India's paradiplomacy practice and how it influences the formulation of the nation's politics.

Reference

1. Aguirre, I. (1999). Making sense of paradiplomacy? An intertextual enquiry about a concept in search of a definition. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 9(1), 185-209. Doi: 10.1080/13597569908421078
2. Aldecoa, F., & Keating, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Paradiplomacy in Action: The Foreign Relations of Subnational Governments*. F. Cass.
3. Alger, C. F. (1977). The impact of cities on international systems. *Athens Center of Ekistics*, 44(264), 243-253.
4. Alvarez, M. (2020, Autumn issue of Publius magazine). The Rise of Paradiplomacy in International Relations. *E-international relations*, 14(4).
5. Alvarez, M., Pont, M. L., & Oddone, N. (2019). *Estudios regionales sobre paradiplomacia*. America Latina Global.
6. Andhra pradesh CM Chandrababu Naidu to lead the team to China. (2015, February 21). *Deccan Chronicle*.
7. Atkey, R. G. (1970, Winter). The Role of the Provinces in International Affairs. *International Journal*, 26(1), 249-273. 10.2307/40201032
8. Balzacq, T., Charillon, F., & Ramel, F. (2020). *Global Diplomacy An Introduction to Theory and*

Practice. palgrave macmillan.

9. Basu, D. D. (2020). Introduction to the Constitution of India. LexisNexis Butterworths Wadhwa Nagpur.
10. Bhambhari, C. P. (2012, March 31). Indian foreign policy: Foreign or provincial? Read more at: https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/indian-foreign-policy-foreign-or-provincial/articleshow/12475841.cms?utm_source=contentofinterest&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=cppst. The Economic Times.
11. Bora, A. (2024, April-June). Paradiplomacy in India: Expanding State's Influence in International Relations. Indian Journal Of Social Studies and Humanities, 1(18), 60-68.
12. Cornago, N. (2000). Exploring the global dimensions of paradiplomacy Functional and normative dynamics in the global spreading of subnational involvement in international affairs. Forum of Federations.
13. Duchacek, I. D. (1987). Rural Governments in the Federal System. Publius, 17(4), 215-217.
14. Fawcett, L., & Serrano, M. (Eds.). (2005). Regionalism and Governance in the Americas: Continental Drift. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
15. Fernandes, S. (2019). Paradiplomacy: A strategy for India's states. Observer Research Foundation.
16. Gujarat to set up international desks overseas to attract FDI. (2014, July 6). The Economic Times.
17. Hall, I. (2019). Modi and the Reinvention of Indian Foreign Policy. Bristol University Press.
18. Hazarika, O. B. (2014, January-March). Evolving Dynamics of Federalism and Foreign Policy: Engagement of Indian States in External Affairs. Indian Foreign Affairs Journal, 9(1), 33-45.
19. Hicks, U. K., & Wright, D. S. (1981, February). Federalism: Failure and Success: A Comparative Study. The Journal of Politics, 43(1), 236-238.
20. Holsti, K. J., & Levy, T. A. (1974). Bilateral Institutions and Transgovernmental Relations Between Canada and the United States. International Organization, 28(4), 875-901.
21. Jacob, H. (2016, October 10). Putting the Periphery at the Center: Indian States' Role in Foreign Policy. Carnegie India. <https://carnegieindia.org/2016/10/10/putting-periphery-at-center-indian-states-role-in-foreign-policy-pub-64724>
22. Jain, P., & Maini, T. S. (2017). India's Subnational Governments Foray into the International Arena. Japanese Journal of Political Science, Cambridge University Press, 18(2), 286-312. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109917000032>
23. Jha, P. C. (2014). Federalism, Regionalism and State Paradiplomacy in India; In Federalism in India: Towards a Fresh Balance of Power (M. Sahu, L. Lobo, & J. Shah, Eds.). Rawat Publications.
24. Jha, P. C. (2019). Current Trends and Issues in Indian Federalism. Indian Journal of Public Administration, 65(2), 377-389. 10.1177/0019556119844591
25. Keating, M. (1999). Paradiplomacy and Regional Networking. Forum of Federations.
26. Keohane, R. O., & Nye, Jr., J. S. (1974, Autumn). Introduction: The Complex Politics of Canadian-American Interdependence. Canada and the United States: Transnational and Transgovernmental Relations, 28(4), 595-607.
27. Kinchad, J. (1990). Constituent diplomacy in federal politics and the nation-state: Conflict and co-operation (P. 54-75) In Federalism and international relations: The role of subnational units (P. Soldatos & H. J. Michelmann, Eds.). Oxford University Press. 0198274912 : 9780198274919
28. Kuznetsov, A. S. (2014). Theory and Practice of Paradiplomacy. Routledge.
29. Leach, R. H., Walker, D. E., & Leavy, T. A. (2008). Province-state trans-border relations: a

- preliminary assessment. *Canadian Public Administration*, 16(3), 468-482.
30. Liu, T., & Song, Y. (2020). Chinese Paradiplomacy: A Theoretical Review. *SAGE Open*, 1-14. 10.1177/2158244019899048
 31. Mariana, C. (2016). La Política Internacional Subnacional: una propuesta para el abordaje del accionar contemporáneo en Argentina. *Desafíos*, 28(1), 297-334.
 32. Mattoo, A., & Jacob, H. (2009). The republic of India (P. 169-187) In *Foreign relations in federal countries* (H. J. Michelmann, Ed.). McGill-Queen's University Press.
 33. Mesupnikom, N. (2021). Inadequacy of Paradiplomacy Theory: The Case of Fukuoka and Thailand. *Japanese Studies Journal*, 16-36.
 34. Michelmann, H. J., & Soldatos, P. (Eds.). (1990). *Federalism and International Relations: The Role of Subnational Units*. Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, Oxford [England], New York.
 35. Milner, H. V. (1997). *Interests, institutions, and information : domestic politics and international relations*. Princeton University Press.
 36. 'Modi announces \$2-bn credit to Bangladesh'. (2015, June 6). *The Hindu*.
 37. Mukherjee, A. (2016). State and Paradiplomacy in India: An Analysis of West Bengal's Engagement with Bangladesh. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 51(1), 42-57.
 38. Natarajan, A. (2019). Democratization of Foreign Policy: India's Experience with Paradiplomacy. *Law and Development Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ldr-2019-0044>
 39. Nayar, B. R. (2006, February 01). India in 2005: India Rising, but Uphill Road Ahead. *Asian Survey*, 46(1), 95-106.
 40. Nganje, F. (2014). Paradiplomacy and the democratisation of foreign policy in South Africa. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 21(1), 89-107. 10.1080/10220461.2014.895082
 41. Novialdi, R., Rasanjani, S., & Ramadani, I. (2022). The Practice of Paradiplomacy in Indo-Pacific Region: Opportunities and Challenges. *International Journal of Advances in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(1), 1-5.
 42. Pant, H. V. (2016). *Paradiplomacy and India: Growing role of states in foreign policy*. Observer Research Foundation.
 43. Paul, S., & Chatterjee, R. (2020). Paradiplomacy in India: A Comparative Analysis of Subnational Engagement in Foreign Policy. *Indian Foreign Affairs Journal*, 15(1), 19-35.
 44. Pietrasiak, M., Bywalec, G., Kamiński, T., Mierzejewski, D., & Słowikowski, M. (2018). *Paradiplomacy in Asia: Case Studies of China, India and Russia*. Łódź University Press.
 45. Schiavon, J. A. (2019). *Comparative Paradiplomacy*. Routledge.
 46. Sharma, C. K., Destradi, S., & Plagemann, J. (2020). *Partisan Federalism and Subnational Governments' International Engagements: Insights from India*. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 50(4), 566-592.
 47. Sinha, A., & Dorschner, J. P. (2010). *India: Rising Power or a Mere Revolution of Rising Expectations?* The University Of Chicago Press Journals, 42(1).
 48. Slaughter, A.-M. (2004). *A New World Order*. Princeton University Press.
 49. Sridharan, K. (2003). Federalism and foreign relations: the nascent role of the Indian states. *Asian Studies Review*, 27(4), 463-489. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10357820308713389>
 50. Tewari, F. (Ed.). (2016). *Paradiplomacy: Can India learn from China?* Observer Research Foundation. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/southasia/2016/11/18/paradiplomacy-can-india-learn-from-china/>
 51. Tewari, F. (2017). *Paradiplomacy in India: Evolution and Operationalisation*. Observer Research

Foundation.

52. Tomasz, K., Żelazo, A., & Szczudlik, J. (2019). The Subnational Dimension of EU-China Relations. Polski Instytut Spraw Międzynarodowych.
53. Wallander, C. A. (2007). Russia The Domestic Sources of a Less-than-Grand Strategy (A. J. Tellis & M. Wills, Eds.). National Bureau of Asian Research.
54. Yarovoy, G. O. (2013). Revisiting paradiplomacy as a tool for regional development. *Studia Humanitatis Borealis*, 1, 28-41.