


Milan Jazbec

DIPLOMACY AND GLOBALIZATION



Diplomacy and Globalization: *Theorizing, Cases and Synergies*

By the same Author on Diplomacy

- Konzularni odnosi* (Consular Relations) (1997)
Diplomacija in Slovenci (Diplomacy and Slovenes) (Ed., 1998)
*The Diplomacies of New Small States:
The Case of Slovenia with some comparison from the Baltics* (2001)
Diplomacija in varnost (Diplomacy and Security) (2002)
Security and Diplomacy in the Western Balkans (2007)
Vojaška in obrambna diplomacija (Military and Defense Diplomacy) (2007)
Bazat e diplomacisë (Diplomatic Handbook) (Albanian, 2008, reprints 2010 and 2015)
Osnove diplomacije (Diplomatic Handbook) (2009)
Martin Krpan – diplomat in vojščak (Martin Krpan – Diplomat and Warrior)
(Slovene, 2009, translations in Macedonian, Albanian and Russian, 2018)
Equal Opportunities in Slovene Diplomacy (Slovene, 2010, English 2011 – Jazbec et al.)
Diplomacija za osnovnošolce (Diplomacy for Primary Schools) (2010)
Diplomacija med teorijo in prakso (Diplomacy Between Theory and Practice)
(2011 – Udovič et al.)
Sociology of Diplomacy (Ed., 2012, Slovene; English, 2014; Russian, 2015)
Diplomat Martin Krpan (2015, Slovene/English)
Znanstvena misel in publicistično delo Milana Jazbeka
(Selected Scientific Works and Other Contribution by Milan Jazbec)
(2021, Trilogy, selected papers 1990–2021)
Slovenska diplomacija: Izbor prispevkov in pogledov 1990–2021
(The Slovene Diplomacy: Selected Contributions and Views 1990–2021) (2022)

Diplomacy in Fiction

- Dama v belem* (Lady in White, trilogy on diplomacy)
Book One: *Mavrica izza duše* (The Rainbow beyond the Soul)
(Slovene, 2006, reprint 2019; translations: Albanian 2008 and 2016, Turkish 2012,
Albanian/Arabic 2017, Montenegro 2019, Macedonian, Roma, English and Spanish 2020)
Book Two: *Iskanje izgubljene duše* (In a Search of a Lost Soul)
(Slovene, 2017; Macedonian, 2020)
A Slovene in Belgrade: 1987–1991
(Slovene 1999 and 2008; German, 2005/2006, Turkish, 2014)

Forthcoming

- Short Stories on Diplomacy (Slovene)
Martin Krpan – Slovene Diplomat and Warrior (Polish translation)

Milan Jazbec

Diplomacy and Globalization:
Theorizing, Cases and Synergies

Založba Kulturni center Maribor
DiploFoundation
Maribor / Malta, 2023

Edition: Diplomatic Press 002
Milan Jazbec: Diplomacy and Globalization: *Theorizing, Cases and Synergies*
The Badger School of Diplomacy Book One

© Kulturni center, art production and publishing, 2023, Slovenia
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without explicit prior written permission of the Publisher Kulturni center Maribor.

General Editor: Dušan Hedl

Editor in-Chief: Peter Dobaj

Editor: Gregor Lozar

Reviewers:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Natalija Shikova

Assist. Prof. Dr. Dancho Markovski, Ambassador

Foreword: Edislav Manetovic

Afterword: Eva Jerman

Design: Peter Dobaj

Layout: Branimir Trošić

Front cover page illustration: Dušan Ristovski

Front cover page design: Branimir Trošić

Published by: Kulturni center Maribor

Co-published and e-book by:

DiploFoundation

www.diplomacy.edu

Art production and publishing:

<https://kulturnicentermariborzalozba.wordpress.com/>

zalozbaknjig@gmail.com

For the Publisher: Aleks Hedl

The book was supported kindly by TAB MAK, Probištip, North Macedonia

The series is supported kindly by Ahmet Ercan Erdoğan,

Slovene Honorary Consul in Trabzon, Türkiye

Printed by:

Studentski Servis, Skopje, North Macedonia

1st print, printed on demand

ISBN 978-961-7186-48-2

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	vii
Note from the Publisherix
Foreword: <i>Diplomacy from social conditioning to personal agency</i> (Edislav Manetovic)	xiii
Outline: <i>The Evolution of Diplomacy and Social Sciences</i>	1
Part One: Contemplation of the Field	
Political, Historical and Diplomatic Frame: 1648–1989	27
Diplomacy and Globalization: <i>An Outlook of the Intersection in Five Theses</i>	46
Time, Territory and Media in the Development of Diplomacy: <i>Selected Aspects</i>	52
Dialogue in the Postmodern Diplomacy: <i>Communicating and Discussing</i>	57
The Sociology of Diplomacy: <i>A General Outline with Some Aspects and Dilemmas</i>	69
Part Two: Topics and Aspects	
European Integration Process: 1989–2019	97
Diplomacy and Ethics: <i>Focusing on an Individual</i>	124
Diplomatic Functions in the Era of Postmodern Diplomacy: <i>Changing, but Everlast</i>	137
Philosophy of the Preambles of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic and on Consular Relations: <i>What is inside and What is Behind?</i>	153
Globalized Diplomacy: <i>The Case of Slovenia</i>	178
Equal Opportunities in the Slovene Diplomacy: <i>Laying the Ground and Facing Challenges</i>	187
Part Three: Diplomacy and Literature	
Isaac Asimov's Foundation Trilogy and its Perception of Diplomacy: <i>Envoys, Protocol, Talks</i>	202
Arthur C. Clarke's Childhood's End: <i>Ad Hoc Diplomacy and Three Types of its Envoys</i>	229
Ursula K. Le Guin's <i>The Left Hand of Darkness</i> : <i>A Bilateral Envoy on the Posting</i>	254
Alek Popov's Mission London: <i>A Mini Handbook of Diplomatic Practice</i>	279
Juan de Recacocha's American Visa: <i>A Symbol of Hope and a Means of Salvation</i>	296
Fran Levstik's Martin Krpan: <i>Slovene National Hero as a Metaphor for a Diplomat</i>	321
Addendum: <i>The Story of Martin Krpan from Vrh</i>	343
Closure: <i>The End of Diplomacy</i>	361
Afterword: <i>Adapting approach to the issue</i> (Eva Jerman)	367
Reviews	371
References	379
About the Author	395

List of Tables

Selected authors, their works and areas discussing diplomacy	22
The Development of Diplomacy	36
Characteristics of Structures and Networks – A Comparison	41
Elements and Frame of the Paradigm Change	43
Time and territory in the development of diplomacy	53
Defining topics and their appearance.....	56
Relations and aspects of dialogue in postmodern diplomacy.....	64
Aspects of Security.....	128
Aspects of the Methodological Framework	131
Differences in procedural arrangements	134
Periodization of Diplomacy	145
Global Multilateral Series	181
A Comparison of Organizational and Topical Aspects.....	184

Acknowledgements

This book was developed from papers that were produced during the last decade and a half. The period coincides with my intensive academic career, spanning from Assistant Professor of diplomacy in 2004 to Full Professor of diplomacy a decade later in 2015. From this point of view, the volume presents evolution of my thought on diplomacy in structurally changed international environment after the end of the Cold War. It is the time in which, as I like to point out, globalization was definitely and fully globalized. Coincidentally and by pure chance, it is also the period during which diplomatic studies made their case as an independent scientific endeavour.

On another note, as I use the term “developed”, I want to emphasise that this edition is not just a mere collection of papers, mechanically put together in a single volume. At least two things prove this. Firstly, I connect contributions with their polished abstracts and try to make with this reading of the text as a whole. With this approach, the reader gets an impression to be dealing with a developing text. I have kept, though, key words, but more as highlights to each article, to be in line with the changed nature of abstracts. Secondly, references are listed all together at the end of the book, as it is usual practice with monographs. The reader does not get disturbed with separate list after each piece. This is not just a mere visual approach and effect.

Papers are brought together on a topical base and not chronologically. Still, it is important to state that the first one in this sequence was written upon my lecture at the Diplomatic Academy of Vienna in October 2006, discussing diplomacy and security after the end of the Cold War, directly pointing out the change of paradigm that was starting to take place. This contribution, that is the leading one in Part One of the book, touches upon main terms, concepts and processes here discussed: post-modern diplomacy, globalization, the end of the Cold War, and the Peace of Westphalia. They also present the basic frame of my whole scientific research interest and field, with the changing nature of diplomacy in its focus.

It should also be added that the intersection between diplomacy and globalization that could be clearly followed throughout here published contributions emerged as a rather spontaneous result of my writing. There was no initial intention to produce a volume on this, while I was writing these articles during previous years. But I see it as normal to reflect and follow topics, trends and ideas that were leading this way. One of the side effects of such approach, hopefully not to disturbing for the reader, is that there is an amount of repetition of key topics in the following pages. Hence, I would be pleased if readers could preferably take this within the understanding of that ancient saying that repetition leads to science.

The book is divided in three parts, while being introduced by a study on how diplomacy has been researched by various social sciences since its inception, starting with history and arriving all the way to sociology of diplomacy.

The first part presents with five elaborations on theoretical opening, leading to discussing in the second part concrete topics and aspects (with six contributions) and offering in the third part a highly unique discussion on diplomacy and literature (six cases). Henceforth, I would say that the monograph contributes both to diplomatic studies and to sociology of diplomacy (my second book in this field). I tried to compose the book as a complete text, although consisting of several, originally independent texts.

Finally, I have to express my immense thanks to a number of persons and institutions that made it possible for this book to appear. Firstly, to a vast audience of students from practically all around the globe that listened to (in situ or on line) and enriched my lectures with their reflections; secondly, to anonymous reviewers at journals, where my papers were published; thirdly, to numerous universities, research institutes and other institutions that offered me a podium to present my views on discussed topics; fourthly, to Dušan Ristovski for the front cover page illustration; then to my friend Ahmet Ercan Erdoğan, Slovene Honorary Consul in Trabzon, Türkiye, for his generous support of the series; and last but not at all least, to the both publishers: Kulturni center Maribor for printed edition and Diplo for e-book.

Ljubljana, March 2023

M. J.

Note from the Publisher

The *Badger School of Diplomacy* book series is authored by Milan Jazbec, PhD, Ambassador and Professor of diplomacy, poet and writer, member of the first generation of Slovene diplomats, employed at the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia.

The series brings his dwellings and contemplations of selected topics from the world of diplomacy he has belonged to during the last three and a half decades. This is the period after the end of the Cold War that has marked him decisively in all aspects. Being a career diplomat, first of the former Yugoslavia (1987 – 1991) and then of the newly independent Slovenia, he draws from his rich diplomatic experiences as well as from his innovative academic contribution to diplomatic studies.

Diplomacy and Globalization, as the first one, discusses the interaction between diplomacy and globalization that has emerged with the end of the previous century. Immense structural changes of the international community and by far not less dramatic advancement of media and transport technology produced a stream of transformation that three decades later resulted in the change of the paradigm. The book presents a selection of his papers from the period 2006 – 2021.

As the title of the series suggests, more books are to follow. The Badger School of Diplomacy origins from 2021, marking the bicentennial anniversary of the Congress of Ljubljana.

To my students

Foreword: *Diplomacy from social conditioning to personal agency*

Milan Jazbec's intellectual and professional evolution occurred during a historical period marked by major changes. At the global level, the Cold War ended and subsequently the international system transformed from a bipolar to a unipolar one. Simultaneously, these structural changes were accompanied by an ever-increasing process of globalization; as the author notes, since the end of the Cold War, globalization was "fully globalized." At the regional level, the country of his birth imploded, and its component parts emerged as small new states. Hence, this book can be read as a product of these transformations within which Jazbec was, and continues to be, embedded both as an academic and a diplomat.

However, Jazbec does not succumb to the weight of structural forces either as a professor of diplomacy or as a practitioner. While he is acutely aware that in international relations structures constrain agency of actors, his academic work illustrates that actors, even small states, maintain a degree of agency. This is perhaps best illustrated in the chapter on Slovenia's "globalized diplomacy" in which the author describes the activities of Slovenia's diplomatic service between 1998 and 2008. During this ten-year period, this new small state held a non-permanent seat on the UN Security Council, chairmanship of the OSCE, presidency of the EU Council, chairmanship of the Human Security Network, chairmanship of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency, presidency of the EU Council, and presidency of the Council of Minister of the Council of Europe. According to Jazbec, this outstanding success of Slovenia's diplomacy was due to its ability to detect the opportunities globalization provides to small states and used it to reinforce its statehood.

The author's personal history can also be read as an ongoing struggle to maintain agency within given historical conditions. By simultaneously pursuing academic and diplomatic careers, he continues to maintain personal agency. This strategy did not only serve him very well, but it equally well enabled him to serve Slovenian students, the Slovene state, and the wider region. Not only did he become the first Slovenian academic and diplomat, but he is well recognized regionally. His academic works were translated into many languages, including those spoken in the successor states of the former Yugoslavia. On the other hand, his work as a diplomat was recognized in 2019 in Sarajevo when he received the Award for the Best Ambassador in Southeast Europe. This is an exemplary personal history which does not surprise me in the least. I have known the author since the late 1980s and still remember one of our conversations during which he recommended: Keep as many paths open as you can because you never know which one will close in the future.

This book is a wide-ranging contemplation about the history of diplomacy, continuities and changes in its practice, as well as continuities and changes in the way it is studied. Jazbec identifies four distinct periods in the evolution of diplomacy. Each of the four periods was the outcome of four *longue durée* social processes, which impacted the ways in which diplomacy was practiced. The practice of diplomacy changed as socio-economic conditions changed. The pre-agricultural and the early agricultural period gave birth to first diplomatic relations. The second period, classical diplomacy, developed during the late agricultural period and the early days of industrialization. The period of modern diplomacy correlates with an industrial and information society. Finally, postmodern diplomacy evolves within the context of a full-blown, well-integrated, information society. In each of these periods, the author suggests, changes in the social context transformed the practice of diplomacy because diplomacy is always determined by "concrete historical and social situation."

Like the practice of diplomacy, the study of diplomacy has undergone change as well. Jazbec meticulously traces the evolution of this field of inquiry from its inceptions by reading major texts starting with Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*. His analytical observations about the evolution of the field are based on close readings of some founding texts from various disciplines in the social sciences and humanities. His exploration of the slow birth of diplomatic studies as

a distinct field of social scientific inquiry does not end with an analysis of contemporary studies of diplomacy. Jazbec does not confine himself to working within the well-established scientific fields, even if they are relatively new. In search of new and thicker ways of understanding diplomacy he has been trying for years to carve a space for a subfield of sociology which he and a handful of other scholars call sociology of diplomacy.

Readers of this book have an opportunity to read two texts on sociology of diplomacy. In the chapter entitled “Sociology of Diplomacy: A General Outline with Some Aspects and Dilemmas,” Jazbec makes a strong argument why merging sociology and the study of diplomacy is needed. The purpose is to “deepen and enhance theorizing of diplomacy.” The underlying idea for the necessity of creating this new subfield is, unsurprisingly, the same idea that informs much of this author’s thinking about various aspects of diplomacy; it is that the mode of diplomacy depends on a given social and historical context. In “Equal Opportunities in the Slovene Diplomacy: Laying the Ground and Facing Challenges,” the author applies the framework elaborated in the previous chapter. In it one sees how a sociological approach to diplomacy raises new questions and does, indeed, offer new insights. If one agrees that diplomacy does not exist in a vacuum, then one must agree that sociology of diplomacy is a promising new subfield of inquiry.

Both students and practitioners of diplomacy will benefit from reading this book. While the term “globalization” in the book’s title might lead some to think that it is a book only on relatively recent aspects of diplomacy, it is far from that. The author’s broader definition of globalization enables him to use diplomacy as a vehicle with which he traces the slow process of humanities integration and its growing interdependence. Chapters on the more technical aspects of diplomacy are just as important, especially considering current events related to the ongoing Russo-Ukrainian war. This war, like all wars, exemplifies the failure of diplomacy, and should inject a sense of urgency to learn more about diplomatic techniques.

New York, 19 April, 2022

Edislav Manetovicⁱ

ⁱ Associate Professor of International Relations, State University of New York at Old Westbury, USA.

Outline:

*The Evolution of Diplomacy and Social Sciences*¹

With this text, we offer a prelude to our discussion on diplomacy and globalization. Hence, we make a selected walk through the evolution of the social sciences' research of diplomacy. We discuss the way, content and approach the latter has been the research object of the former. This gives us the conceptual frame and presents us with the style as well as with the way we materialize our research endeavour.

Diplomacy as a management of relations between states has millennia long tradition. Developed through four main phases (early, classical, modern and postmodern), it has always been in a function of a concrete social and historical situation as well as dependent on it. In addition to this, it has always been also determined by the “družbeno-funkcionalna bližina”. Diplomacy is a highly complex social term and phenomenon.

Its appearance within the context of social sciences started with the approach of history (Thucydides), continued with political sciences (Machiavelli) and followed by international law (Grotius). Nicolson and Satow launched a focused research of diplomacy that led through theories of international relations, international law, history, diplomatic and consular law, and political sciences to a forming of diplomatic studies (Berridge) a few decades ago. Researched by sociology of diplomacy (Jazbec), diplomacy demonstrates its vitality, continuity and interdisciplinary substance.

¹ Originally published in *Journal of Law and Politics*, vol. 2, issue 2, June, 2021, pp. 1–17, upon the author's presentation as a key note speech at the 3rd International Balkan University Conference “Challenges of the Changing World – Building a Safer Future”, June 2021.

Social sciences remain to be the main research frame for contemplating, implementing and use of diplomacy in understanding and managing relations among international actors. We try to keep this in mind throughout our whole exercise in this book.

As the most typical terms for this part of the text that serve as de facto key words we point out the following ones: *diplomacy, social sciences, history, political sciences, international law, diplomatic studies, sociology of diplomacy.*

Introduction

One could state that diplomacy is basically and broadly understood as a management of relations between states (and other international actors) for the purpose of peaceful settling of issues between them.² This definition is broadly accepted as a corner stone of its understanding and as a point of departure for deeper and more complex consideration. Additionally, one should perceive diplomacy as organization, tool, knowledge, behaviour and skill, what all leads to its understanding as a multilayered social process. Our starting understanding also illustrates the continuity of diplomacy as a social phenomenon from its first origins dating at least approximately 3,000 years B.C. Throughout its evolution diplomacy remained the same in its very basic mission, while adding the institution of the residential missions and both way communication between the sending authority and its mission at the receiving authority, what was introduced during the period of the Italian City States approximately six hundred years ago.

Practicing diplomacy hence did witness important changes during this time, while always adapting its methods of operation and forms as well as approaches to the changing historical situation.³ A very basic deduction of diplomacy would bring us to only two terms of its defining elements: diplomats observe and report.⁴ Everything what diplomats do refers to these two elements

² Comp. for example Anderson (1993), Barston (2006:1), Berridge (2015), Feltham (1994), Nicolson (1988:3–5), Satow (1994:3), and Watson (1991).

³ Comp. Benko (1998:40).

⁴ Paterson (1969) understands diplomacy as information gathering machinery.

and to all what derives from them. It has been different, however, with a reflection of diplomacy in theoretical approach and contemplation. It is exactly this aspect that we intend to dwell upon in this paper. Our research interest aims at the way diplomacy has been theorized during the time of its existence. This means we are not primarily interested in authors alone who were dealing with the study of diplomacy, but in social sciences within which diplomacy has been examined. We explore, which sciences (scientific approaches) have been discussing diplomacy since its beginning, why exactly they and how as well as who were the authors. Via facti this also means that we touch upon the authors, too.

Our main thesis is that diplomacy has been studied (i.e. described, analyzed, compared, commented, generalized) within the frame of social sciences (or their predecessors). It has been the area of social sciences that led to and enabled the current understanding of diplomacy as a result of their theorizing. We focus only on a few most important and groundbreaking works that initiated and started the research process and paved the way for contemporary independent and interdisciplinary theorizing of diplomacy. With this, we also want to point out that not only diplomacy has been evolving within the frame of social sciences, but that this process also enabled the emergence of an autonomous scientific study endeavour of diplomacy. Although being clearly aware there exist numerous studies of diplomacy, we a) present only the most significant works for a theoretical evolution, b) define and frame the scientific field, c) determine the corresponding authors, and d) place findings in a historical continuum. On a general picture, we place this discussion within the four periods of development of diplomacy: early, classical, modern, and postmodern.

For this purpose, we use the following research methods: analysis, comparison, comment, synthesis and also – since the author is a career diplomat – the method of observing with one's own participation.⁵ However, our basic methodological approach is generalization: we transform within long historical periods events and appearances into trend and discuss them. Here we have in mind the period of the last 2,500 years since the first known written elaboration on diplomacy appeared thus enabling the study of diplomacy in the frame of social sciences.

⁵ For more on this research method comp. Burnham, 2004, and Mason, 2002.

General Overview and Categorization of Approaches

Diplomacy and its understanding have been outcrafted through four big periods of its evolution: early diplomacy, classical, modern and postmodern.⁶ They present four main types of a changing historical and social situation that primarily influence diplomacy.

The period of early diplomacy (from approximately 3,000 B.C. to the Peace of Westphalia in 1648) coincides with the transition from the preagricultural to the agricultural era. This period of change from nomadic to the permanent settlement and social stratification led to the forming of a nation state as a political organization of human society. The first part is marked by more or less mutual existence of regional societies with sporadic contacts, including diplomatic ones, while its end offers the first important origins of globalization.

The period of classical diplomacy (from 1648 to the end of the World War One and the forming of the League of Nations 1918/1920) coincides with the transition from the preindustrial to the industrial era and with colonization processes, marking further step in the advancement of globalization. This was also the period of slow, but steady political transition from aristocratic societies to the liberal political order.⁷ Strong technological development, in particular that of printed media, what enabled the appearance of public opinion, supported this process.

The period of modern diplomacy (from 1920 to the end of the Cold War in 1989) presents the transformation from industrial to information society as well as of decolonization in the second part of the 20th century. This was the era of progressive development of globalization trend, in particular with media advancement (the phenomenon of the global village) and on the economic-financial area with the Bretton Woods arrangements and activities.

The period of postmodern diplomacy (from 1989 onwards) marks the transition to digital society, combined with the immense spread of globalization. In parallel, the international community for the first time in human

⁶ Comp. Jazbec, 2021.a.

⁷ Comp. Fukuyama, 2014.

history faced the question of survival and an increased trend of digitalization of societies. Complementarity between real and digital aspects of humanity is driven by the unprecedented progress of social media.

We use this brief overview to present the interdependence between the groundbreaking historical and structural changes on one side and the periodization of the diplomatic evolution that rests on this process on the other side. One could describe it as changes of social paradigms, driven by processes that were composed of outstanding events.⁸ Hence, also outstanding elaborations on diplomacy, that we dwell on, appeared along those historical changes as a part of their intellectual, but also practical driving forces, being in consequent relation with these changes.

Our belief is that diplomacy has witnessed its evolution and elaboration that has been linked to the presented historical process. We see what we name the evolution of diplomacy in social sciences and its categorization as follows.

The generally accepted first known – in today’s terms – scientific dwelling on diplomacy appeared with the ancient Greek historian and practitioner Thucydides who four centuries before our age put down his record on diplomacy as a part of his elaboration on the Peloponnesian Wars. This was followed almost two millennia later by Italian civil servant, diplomat and philosopher Machiavelli in his treaty *The Prince*, presenting an early but not least classical piece of political sciences reasoning. A century later the Dutch theoretician and diplomat Grotius discussed diplomacy in his *The Law of War and Peace* as the first one within the context of international law. That way diplomacy became a means of legally backed instrument for settling the issue of war and peace. The period of early diplomacy (with Grotius *de facto* already in the classical diplomacy) was the historical and social frame for those fundamental and groundbreaking explanations.

Three hundred years later the first two elaborations on diplomacy appeared that paved the way for concrete, practical and scientific discussing of diplomacy. Satow in his *Guide to Diplomatic Practice* and Nicolson in his *Diplomacy* respectively both produced a classical volume on understanding diplomacy as an issue of international relations and diplomatic practice,

⁸ For the change of a paradigm comp. Jazbec, 2006.a.

connected also to political sciences. Until the turn of the century, a handful of other works followed that dwelled further on these topics. They are *Modern Diplomacy* (Barston, 1988), *The Pure Concept of Diplomacy* (Mahalgaes, 1988), *Diplomat's Handbook of International Law and Practice* (Sen, 1988), *Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between States* (Watson, 1991), *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy* (Anderson, 1993), *Diplomatic Handbook* (Feltham, 1994), and *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory and Administration* (Hamilton and Langhorne, 1995) as well as *Diplomacy* (Kissinger, 1994), the latter being an expanded, thoughtful treaty on political and diplomatic history.⁹ They all added to the two classics and contributed further to the development of what diplomacy is all about. Thus a solid, primarily practical and practitioners background was established, in particular during the late 1980s and the early 1990s that produced a variety of interdisciplinary views on diplomacy. The period of modern diplomacy hosted that reasoning.

The emergence of diplomatic studies as an independent discipline discussing diplomacy followed during the last decade of the previous century as a logical next step. The number and amount of theoretical and practical elaborations on diplomacy from various points of view (primarily international relations theory, international as well as diplomatic and consular law, political sciences, history) that accumulated throughout the previous few decades enabled this steady, but obvious crystallization. Berridge's *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (1995/2015) paved the way, followed by *The Essence of Diplomacy* (Jönsson and Hall, 2005), *The 21st Century Ambassador: Plenipotentiary to Chief Executive* (Rana, 2008), and *The Dynamics of Diplomacy* (Leguey-Feilleux, 2009). In addition, a handful of works added to this upgrade in contemplating diplomacy also in this case. They are *Innovation in Diplomatic Practice* (Melissen, ed., 1999), *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger* (Berridge et al., 2001)¹⁰, *Multistakeholder Diplomacy: Challenges*

⁹ Here we follow the year of publication (and not the alphabetical order of the authors), since this tells us more about the influence of these works on the evolutionary understanding of diplomacy.

¹⁰ For the purpose of this paper, this volume is of special importance and particular usefulness.

and opportunities (Kurbalija and Katrandjiev, eds., 2006), *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations* (Sharp, 2009), *At Home with the Diplomats: Inside a European Foreign Ministry* (Neumann, 2012), and *Understanding International Diplomacy* (Bjola and Kornprobst, 2018).¹¹ The so far accumulation of interdisciplinary views and practitioners approaches to understanding diplomacy started to produce substantial enrichment focused directly on theorizing diplomacy. To generalize, it took one decade to enable a substantial transition towards the emergence of a new discipline, dealing directly with diplomacy.¹² It is our strong belief that only the period of postmodern diplomacy by itself has been able to offer circumstances for such contemplations.

With this, we arrive to a direct inclusion of sociology in the study of diplomacy: *Sociology of Diplomacy: Initial Reading* (Jazbec, ed., 2014.a).¹³ This primarily theoretical, but also strongly empirically backed trial takes into account sociological approach, methodology and apparatus for the study of diplomacy in the context of globalization as the most advanced and complex social and historical situation so far. As additional empirical text, one could list *Emerging Diplomatic Elites in Post-Communist Europe* (Digol, 2010), an exemplary empirical work from the field concerned.¹⁴ The period of post-modern diplomacy is of even more crucial importance for the emergence of sociology of diplomacy than for the diplomatic studies.

Fields, Works and the Authors

In the main part of our paper, we present, elaborate and discuss the importance and contribution of the above listed works and fields in which they were written, to the development of the understanding of diplomacy and its study.

¹¹ For the order of appearance comp. footnote, No 10.

¹² For additional understanding of this process, a highly useful and concise, though brief reference is Murray et al. (2011).

¹³ Original edition in Slovene (2012), with expanded and revised edition in English (2014.a) and translated into Russian, published at the Diplomatic Academy of Ukraine, Kiev (2015).

¹⁴ For this and some other possible references comp. Jazbec, 2014.b: 36–41.

We briefly present the main points and focus of those works, their contribution, and the context in which they emerged as well as comment briefly on their authors.

Our method is as follows: we take ten main works in four periods with an aim to find out decisive contributions to discussing (present, elaborate, compare and comment) diplomacy in establishing its purpose. We focus on these ten works that are, to our belief the most important – though not the only ones, as shown above, however the indispensable – for the evolution of elaboration on diplomacy. Above all, we try to argue there exists a clear continuation that these works provide for the appearance and development in the progressing theoretical contemplation on diplomacy within social sciences.

History

The History of the Peloponnesian War (404 B.C.) – Thucydides

One could compare the ancient Greek system of city states with the international system of the 19th century, pointing out its competitiveness, conflict relations, coalition building and negotiation capacity (Benko, 1998: 46). Special missions became frequent instrument of maintaining dialogue among various city-states as well as between their coalitions. In particular the period of 430–404 B.C., known for its constant military conflict between Athens and Sparta and their changeable coalitions offered a suitable theatre for negotiation and other skills necessary to intermediate in those conflicts, settle them and conclude peace agreements between involved parties.

Those circumstances produced the classical historical record *The History of the Peloponnesian War* by Thucydides (c. 460 B.C.–c. 400 B.C.), the Greek ancient historian, observer and active participant as a military commander.¹⁵

His treaty, a detailed record of the war and related activities, provided the first elaboration of the art of negotiation, treaty making, sending emissaries with transmitting messages and those with the task of negotiating (these

¹⁵ For more on Thucydides see <https://www.history.com/topics/ancient-history/thucydides>

two functions were divided between different types of emissaries), with an aim of preventing war, which was unjust hadn't there existed efforts to prevent it. As Sen (1988: 3) points out, "Thucydides, the Greek historian, speaks of diplomatic relations among the Greeks, and it is stated that even at that time ambassadors were ceremoniously received and courteously treated in each other's territory". According to Nicolson (1988: 7), "[A]s Greek civilization developed, and as relations between the several city states became at once closer and more competitive" this consequently influenced "the increasing complexity of the commercial and political relations between the several city states" (ibid.). Hence, "it became necessary to raise the standard of this rudimentary diplomatic service" (ibid.). Among peculiarities of that type of diplomacy one could point out that diplomatic tasks were usually carried out by more persons at the same time and not only by one emissary. This historical record provided descriptions of a dynamic diplomatic business, diplomatic conferences (the issue of procedure) and pointing out also some basic understanding of diplomatic immunities (ibid., pp. 8–9).

To wrap up, the masterpiece of Thucydides offers an inside view, though perhaps not always a direct one, in the origins of the diplomatic conduct that paved the way for later articulation. The author is clear in one thing: "Thucydides himself indicates the 'unique importance' of the dialogue" (Howse, 2013: 22). Moreover, this is what diplomacy is practically all about.

Political Sciences

The Prince (1532) – Nicollo Machiavelli

There is much of a similarity between the period of the ancient Greek city-states and the medieval Italian city-states roughly two millennia later. Both presented a conglomerate of small states striving for dominance in their international environment. The former primarily in the Eastern Mediterranean, both on the land and on the sea, while the latter in northern Italy, but as well in the Mediterranean Sea, though on a much bigger scale. Their rivalry was political, diplomatic and economic thus producing circumstances for the

second substantial record on diplomacy, this time from the political sciences' point of view.

The Prince presents the first thorough text on the art of governing thus establishing political sciences as a way of discussing the business of top politicians. Machiavelli is best known for his political and policy advice "the ends justifies the means". From one point of view, it is the very foundation of later realistic theory of international relations and from another it influenced highly the way diplomats present state's interests in the international community. Although The Prince does not contain direct reflections on diplomacy, it paves the way for them. Machiavelli's views on diplomacy are presented primarily in his diplomatic reports (1502–1506). The latter offer an insightful view on the style, structure and usefulness of diplomatic reporting (Machiavelli, 1985: 483–516).

His diplomatic missions gave him an opportunity not only to observe the conduct of diplomacy, but also to practice it. Additionally, with reporting he offered his attitude to diplomatic practice and its reflection, complementary to his high administrative and political positions that he held. Overall, he "gives special emphasis to information-gathering and it might be thought that this is because of his own experience as an envoy" (Berridge, 2001.a). "Knowledge of the world (...) must be supplied in great part by the diplomat" (ibid.). He argues that diplomats report for policy purposes (ibid, p.19), but they "were not encouraged to add personal comments of advice" (ibid).¹⁶ For him, "pure persuasion (...) was rarely sufficient" (ibid., p. 20), since "even over the short term the most brilliant diplomacy would not be able to create power of thin air" (ibid.). In spite of Machiavellianism, coined after his political and governing principles,¹⁷ these views show his deep understanding and limits of diplomacy. Henceforth, he "clearly believed that diplomacy must be

¹⁶ The current diplomatic practice demands from diplomats, ambassadors in particular, concrete policy advice. This, however, has to be clearly separated from the report as such, by the book at the end of the report.

¹⁷ However, Benner (2013:326) claims that The Prince "repeatedly shows that respect for other people's freedom and a concern for justice are bedrocks of lasting power and security".

continuous rather than episodic activity” (ibid., p. 21) with an aim to keep in constant, rapid and secure communication with home” (ibid.). Finally, “diplomacy was an important instrument of the state” (ibid., p. 24) that should be “permanent and at all places, with enemies as well as friends” (ibid., p. 22).¹⁸ For this to achieve, “full ambassadors [have to be] selected from among the most of distinguished citizens of the state” (ibid., p. 21). An evergreen advice from one of the most outstanding scholars and practitioners of diplomacy.

International Law

On the Law of War and Peace (1625) – Hugo Grotius

The Thirty Years War (1618–1648) from one side and the fact that the vast German territory was fragmented in numerous – in today’s terms – small states of different political settlement on the other side, produced an international environment, basically comparable to the two previously discussed ones. Again, the issue of war and peace was of a dominant importance, hence also the constant trial to mediate with this purpose. In a highly fragmented Europe, torn apart in the religious conflicts between Catholics and Protestants, that was tellingly illustrated by Hobbes (“Homo homini lupus” and “war of all against all”), a pioneer legal discussion *On the Law of War and Peace* by the Dutch philosopher, statesman, jurist, scholar and diplomat Hugo Grotius, emerged.¹⁹

That far-reaching and highly substantial volume paved the way for the emergence of international law with an aim to restrain and regulate war as well as to minimize violence as much as possible. As far as diplomacy is concerned, it provided a legal basis for diplomatic activities and for the consequent conduct of international relations, namely as Berridge (2001.b: p. 64)

¹⁸ It is important to notice that enemies are in the forefront of diplomatic attention.

¹⁹ Grotius was the Swedish Ambassador to France from 1634–1644. For more on Grotius see <http://www.britannica.com/biography/Hugo-Grotius> and <http://www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/grotius>

argues, “Grotius believes that all aspects of the relations between states are subject to law”.

Discussions on diplomacy and the way Grotius developed them are similar to those of his two here elaborated predecessors. He did not produce much and direct dwelling, but was via facti and indirectly very substantial. His strict belief was “that diplomacy plays a vital role” (ibid., p. 52), what was directly connected with “his great hostility to war” (ibid., p. 53). Next, he clearly links diplomacy with statehood claiming “that the right of legation is (...) an exclusive attribute of sovereignty” (ibid., p. 54). This means that “only those sent by ‘rulers with sovereign powers’ to similar bodies enjoy the right of legation” (ibid.).

Overall, Grotius presents in his magna volume (and related writings) a corner stone in understanding diplomacy as well as in its developing and founding it on the premises of the international law. His dwellings “place diplomacy at a premium in his system” (ibid., p. 64). Furthermore, “the outlines of the modern law [on diplomacy] are for the first time clearly recognizable” (ibid., p. 67). Together with the contributions of Thucydides and Machiavelli, he laid the ground for contemporary understanding of diplomacy. They all placed this understanding firmly within the frame of social sciences.²⁰ The residential diplomacy and both way diplomatic communication between the sending authority and its mission at the receiving authority, which emerged during this period, formed the outlook of diplomacy for the next centuries.

International Relations and Diplomatic Practice

Guide to Diplomatic Practice (1917) – Ernest Satow

Satow’s *Guide to Diplomatic Practice* is the first written indepth study of diplomatic practice on a whole as we still understand and exercise it today.²¹

²⁰ Among references on broader understanding of Grotius, one could also list Tuck, 2005.

²¹ As the first referential elaboration on the work of the ambassador as a representative as well as an institution, counts *The Ambassador and His Function* by Wicquefort (comp. Keens-Soper, 2001).

Together with Nicolson's *Diplomacy* it forms the classical volume to study, understand, implement and develop diplomacy. Hence, both authors and their works are widely understood as classics of diplomacy. These two works are complementary as well as open for further theoretical elaboration and practical implementation that they continue to inspire. As such they present the cornerstone of diplomacy as a profession and for further dwelling on its various aspects, understanding and meaning.

This Guide consists of five parts: Diplomacy in general; Diplomatic agents in general; Consular matters; International transactions; and International organizations. It is written in a manner of an outstanding diplomatic manual, meaning that concrete presentations are strongly backed by numerous practical examples.²² The author is highly detailed, meaning also useful to the same extent, discussing from one point of view commonly known and used topics as privileges and immunities, precedence, *persona non grata*, function, privileges and immunities of consuls to particularities as maritime honours, diplomacy and radio, to reservations, notice of termination and registration. Being a career diplomat himself, his Guide is full of expertise, experience and contemplation.

Satow puts forward four elements for his understanding of diplomacy (1994: 3). For him, diplomacy is firstly, the management of international relations by negotiation; secondly, it means the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys; thirdly, it is the business or art of the diplomatists; and fourthly, it is skill or address in the conduct of international intercourse and negotiations. Further on, he interprets it also as subject of study at universities and as the diplomatic career (*ibid.*).

Without a necessity to explore Satow's more detailed, one could state that also in the era of postmodern diplomacy his advice, hint and thoughtful word remain a reliable point of departure for any diplomat's work. Even more, it would be possible to claim that for any diplomatic endeavour they are more useful than ever.

²² Additional specific of this book is that, while written by Satow, later editions were edited by outstanding experts on diplomacy or statecraft.

Diplomacy (1939) – Harold Nicolson

Nicolson's *Diplomacy* is the first written indepth study on diplomacy, its substance, meaning, method as well as on diplomats (how they work, what are their characteristics). Together with Satow's *Guide to Diplomatic Practice* it forms the classical volume to study, understand, implement and develop diplomacy. Hence, both authors and their works are widely understood as classics of diplomacy. These two works are complementary as well as open for further theoretical elaboration and practical implementation that they continue to inspire. As such they present the cornerstone of diplomacy as a profession and of further dwelling on its various aspects, understanding and meaning.

The main points that stand out in the Content of his book would be origins of organized diplomacy, the development of diplomatic theory, the ideal diplomat, points of diplomatic procedure and diplomatic language.²³ Being a career diplomat himself, his *Diplomacy* is full of expertise, experience and contemplation.

Nicolson puts forward five elements for his understanding of diplomacy (1988: 3–5). For him, diplomacy is firstly, a synonym for 'foreign policy'; secondly, it means negotiation; thirdly, it is the processes and machinery by which such negotiation is carried out; fourthly, it is a branch of the Foreign Service; and fifthly, it is an abstract quality or gift. Next to this, Nicolson refers to the international law (and Grotius) (1988:16) when speaking of the development of diplomatic theory, claiming that "it is possible to recognize the upward curve of progress" (*ibid.*, p. 17). He defines it as follows: "The progress of diplomatic theory has been from the narrow conception of exclusive tribal rights to the wider conception of inclusive common interests" (*ibid.*).

His list of characteristics of an ideal diplomat consists of the following qualities: truth, accuracy, calm, patience, good temper, modesty and loyalty (*ibid.*, p. 67). Henceforth, he takes intelligence, knowledge, discernment, prudence, hospitality, charm, industry, courage and tact for granted (*ibid.*). One could not add anything significant to this arsenal, coined eight decades ago, in spite of

²³ The selection of topics from the book's Content is of the author of this paper. The same goes also for other such presentations in this part of the paper.

living in an era of hyper globalized international community and various digital media tools that seem to dominate also the diplomat's world. On the contrary, for the conduct of diplomatic intercourse, they are more important than ever.

Diplomatic Studies

Diplomacy: Theory and Practice (1995) – Geoff Berridge

The structural complexity of the international community at the turn of the millennium as well as its radical difference in comparison with any previous period provided circumstances for a new view on diplomacy, this “the most important institution of our society of states” (Berridge, 2015: 1).

To our strong belief, it was exactly the quoted author who offered basic parameters for this new stream of thought. His text (1999/2015)²⁴ on diplomacy pointed out, along with the so far typical views on diplomacy and its understanding (diplomatic relations, mission, consular affairs, international organizations, legal background, protocol), rephrased topics like Diplomatic Momentum, and Mediation as well as their different understanding.²⁵ This is being cemented also later on: Diplomatic Momentum, Embassies (The normal embassy, The fortress embassy, The mini-embassy, The multilateral embassy – a highly unconventional and innovative categorization), Public Diplomacy (Rebranding propaganda, The importance of public diplomacy, The role of the foreign ministry, The role of the embassy), and Diplomacy without Diplomatic Relations.²⁶ This illustrates the main shift towards diplomatic studies: from mainly practitioners' handbooks to theorizing diplomacy.

Hence, his view on diplomacy is refreshed, if not renewed already: “Diplomacy is an essential political activity” (2005:1), he claims. Henceforth, “[I]ts

²⁴ Five expanded and updated editions in only a decade and a half. Additional information: after this paper was originally published, already the sixth edition of this book was published (January 2022). Hence, six editions in a decade and a half.

²⁵ Content of the third edition, 2005: viii-ix.

²⁶ Content of the fifth edition, 2015: vii-ix.

chief purpose is to enable states to secure the objectives of their foreign policies without resort to force, propaganda, or law” (ibid.). Next: “Diplomacy is not merely what professional diplomatic agents do” (ibid.), it is more: “It is also carried through many different channels besides the traditional resident mission” (ibid.).²⁷ While Berridge is expressing throughout his writings negotiation as the most important function of diplomacy and firm optimism in the future of diplomacy, two points have to be explicitly noted. Firstly, “the communication revolution has made the resident mission both more responsive and more able to make inputs into policy-making at home” (ibid., p. 215), and secondly, diplomacy “can produce advantages obtainable from the cooperative pursuit of common interests and prevent violence from being employed to settle remaining arguments over the conflicting ones” (ibid., p. 217).

The above presented, though very summed up, serves more as only initial understanding of the influence that the discussed author has had on the emergence of the diplomatic studies. This process has been supported and enriched with many additional works, some of them directly inspired by the here elaborated ideas and views, some of them being their logical and substantial, direct or indirect and complementary follow up.

The Essence of Diplomacy (2005) – Christen Jönsson and Martin Hall

The authors begin their innovative explanation (2005) on diplomacy with a quotation from Sharp (2005:ix) that “[I]t seems very difficult to theorize about diplomacy” to henceforth support it with another quotation from Der Derian that diplomacy has been “particularly resistant to theory”.²⁸ They follow from here to the elaborated remark on the gap between theoreticians and practitioners of diplomacy to pave the way for their – to our mind – decisive contribution to theorizing diplomacy thus enhancing what started with the previously discussed author: the differentia specifica of diplomatic studies rests in

²⁷ Neuhold qualifies it as “demonopolization of foreign ministries” (1992). Comp. also Rana (2008: 9).

²⁸ Mediating Estrangement: A Theory for Diplomacy. Review of International Studies, 13 (1987), p. 91 (quoted from Jönsson and Hall, 2005:1).

their theorizing diplomacy. As we try to present, this endeavor has been rich in substance, innovative in approach and inspiring in follow up.

Hereafter, they “regard diplomacy as a timeless existential phenomenon” (Jönsson and Hall, 2005: 3), so their “theorizing effort” (ibid.) has “its principal focus on diplomacy as an institution rather than diplomatic method” (ibid.).²⁹ For this purpose they “end up with three essential dimensions of diplomacy: communication, representation and reproduction of international society” (ibid., p. 4). The latter occurs “primarily through the instrument of diplomatic recognition” (ibid., p. 5). They specifically point out that these “three conceptual tools are constitutive rather than explanatory” (ibid., p.4). As a part of this introductory outlook, they also give their view on the fact that diplomacy has been marginalized in the theory of international relations.

Diplomacy is then further on discussed within institutionalization and ritualization to be consequently viewed through the lenses of communication and diplomatic representation. With this, they arrive to the main theoretical point as well as innovation, to the issue of the reproduction of international society, with a focus on premodern international societies, and on the modern society of states respectively. They explain that [B]y ‘reproduction of international society’, [we] understand the processes by which a population of polities maintain themselves as a political and social entity” (ibid., p.119). This means, “[D]iplomacy, in brief, contributes to the reproduction of a homogeneous society of territorial states, required to fulfill an increasing number of criteria” (ibid., p. 134).

These all presents a new, fresh and innovative conceptual approach in theorizing diplomacy, pointing out via facti that this phenomenon should be and could be theorized and brings useful output as well. Some aspects in their work already present a step towards sociology of diplomacy, like the Chapter 2 (Analytical Framework) (comp. Jazbec, 2014.b: 36–41).

²⁹ Here one could plant the distinction between diplomatic studies (theorizing diplomacy as an institution) and sociology of diplomacy (theorizing diplomacy as a process).

*The 21st Century Ambassador:
Plenipotentiary to Chief Executive (2008) – Kishan Rana*

To our belief, two aspects in the discussed and thoughtful Rana's exceptional elaboration stand out. One is his point on management in diplomacy, and the other one on diplomacy as a profession. Both offer an outline for future works within this new field.

He starts with presenting the context of his study: "The paradigm change in international affairs since the end of the Cold War, evolving globalization, and the internationalization of external policy" (2008:1) set the scenery for diplomatic activity. This scenery, however, is marked by an "exceptional fluidity in international relations" (ibid., p. 8). From this stems his belief that "today there is a greater functional necessity for the resident ambassador than at any previous time" (ibid., p. 4). In addition, his "ambassador is a master craftsman, whose skills have been accumulated and shaped over time" (ibid., p. 6). However, this ambassador operates in complex international environment with a growing number of actors as well as with a growing complexity of missions and of priorities that change on a daily basis. This "diversity translates into serious management problems, plus a difficulty in imposing a unified approach" (ibid., p. 17) what produces "the transformed plenipotentiary" (ibid., pp. 20–38). From an evergreen plenipotentiary, this institution is becoming more of a chief executive (but by the approach, not by the substance). Postmodern diplomacy, as we understand it (Jazbec, 2021), is significantly characterized by introducing management methods and skills in diplomacy, above all at the senior level in the diplomatic mission. Moreover, as for diplomacy as profession, the "value of a diplomat lay not in any specialist knowledge he might possess, but in his ability to communicate, negotiate and persuade" (Rana, 2008: 27). The management approach enables him to be rational with the decision making process and could focus primarily on what is the essence of his mission.

Rana further on elaborates on gender issues and human resources, leadership in the Embassy (the ship's captain and the Embassy team) as well as on the domestic dimension of diplomat's work (like performance management).

His discussion on globalized diplomacy is a highly substantial resume of the whole approach and serves as a de facto Conclusion. The author claims that “[T]he management of the diplomatic machine has emerged as a major challenge” (ibid., p. 202). This is in a direct correlation with the fact that “[T]he professionalism of the diplomatic system has grown in response to changed functions, in a process that is also linked with the tighter integration of the entire machine with the other stakeholder in international affairs” (ibid.).

Diplomacy reacts to the changing international environment with its internal adaptation and development, what at the same time offers new abilities for its theorizing. The here discussed work is an example of such groundbreaking theorizing accomplishment.

The Dynamics of Diplomacy (2009) – Jean-Robert Leguey-Feilleux

Leguey-Feilleux adds with his comprehensive work (2009) to the so far discussed stream on diplomacy and the way it functions and operates in the contemporary progressively fluid era (i.e. after the end of the Cold War).

He puts in the forefront his analysis “of the changing character of diplomacy – the changing ways in which states and other international actors communicate, negotiate, and otherwise interact” (ibid., p. 1). This means that one could understand diplomacy through the eyes of historians (diplomatic history, de facto history of international relations), practitioners or as understanding it as “a method of political interaction at the international level” (ibid.). Furthermore, “[A]t the core of the concept of diplomacy is the idea of communicating” (ibid.) as well as of the diplomacy being an institution. This lays the ground for his dynamic understanding of diplomacy that is itself a matter, but also a part of change in the shifting international environment.

Elaboration on the dynamics of diplomacy starts from the forces of change that include the consequences of interdependence, the impact of technology, the role of non-state actors, and changes in the diplomatic profession (among others structural causes of professional transformation, evolving diplomatic culture, gender issues, and changing style of interaction). This serves as a contextual layout for the analysis of – also changing – modes of diplomacy. Here

the discussion on track two diplomacy stands out as a sign of the enhanced and broadened theorizing of diplomacy, where synergy between flexibility and openness of diplomacy with its theoretical perception is obvious and welcome.

The structural flux of international relations is “propelled by technology and interdependence” (ibid., p. 355), while “[D]iplomacy will remain a blend of novelty and continuity” (ibid., p.356). One could sum up three consequences, as by the author, among many of them for the future of diplomacy (both for its practitioners as well as for theoreticians). Firstly, “[I]nternational organizations and international conferences have given NGOs greater opportunity to be heard” (ibid., p. 357)³⁰. Secondly, “the work of the embassy has changed and will continue to evolve, thus keeping it capable of meeting new diplomatic needs” (ibid., p. 361). And thirdly, “the increasingly complex web of interactions among international actors reveals a remarkably large number of people actually doing diplomatic work and participating in the diplomatic process” (ibid.).

To wrap up, this work offers both additional and basic input to theorizing diplomacy as an essence of its new discipline.

Sociology of Diplomacy

Sociology of Diplomacy: Initial Reading (2014.a, ed.) – Milan Jazbec

The main idea of this approach is that due to a highly complex social and historical situation after the end of the Cold War one cannot fully comprehend and understand diplomacy without sociological attitude.³¹

The initial idea origins from the study of sociological and organisational aspects of diplomacies of new small states that emerged or renewed

³⁰ Willetts, P. (2000). From ‘Consultative Arrangements’ to Partnership’: The Changing Status of NGOs in Diplomacy at the UN. *Global Governance*, vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 191–212 (quoted from Leguey-Feilleux, 2009:357).

³¹ The author of this paper finds himself here in a rather peculiar position: he has to present his own scientific endeavor. However, he continues to try to employ his usual rational, objective and scientific approach.

their statehood in the mentioned period.³² This approach could be achieved by sociology of diplomacy that would be “based on a) broad instrumentarium which sociology has developed so far for the study of social phenomena, and b) large practical experiences, which diplomacies” (Jazbec, 2001: 207–208) of those states contributed to the field during the first decade of their existence.

For the purpose of this paper, we present two possible definitions of sociology of diplomacy. They are, firstly “a subfield of sociology (that is, a special sociology), which deals with the study of the social conditionality of diplomacy” (Jazbec, 2014.b: 43–44), and secondly “a branch of sociology that studies the social phenomena, relations, and processes, which are included in the shaping and implementing of foreign policy, and which deals with understanding and explaining diplomacy as well as relations between general and other social structures that emerge through this process or participate in it, and the interactions that are thereby produced” (ibid.).³³

Additionally, it should be pointed out that these elaborations also drew among others from the definitions of Satow (“Diplomacy is the management of international relations.” and “Diplomacy is the business or the skill of diplomats” – 1993:4) and Nicolson (“Diplomacy is the process and the means by which these negotiations are carried out.” – 1988: 3–5). Both understand diplomacy also as a process with diplomat as its main actor (comp. Jazbec, 2014.b:27–28). Also, Sharp (Murray et al, 2011: 717) looks at diplomacy as “the institutions and processes by which states, and to a growing extent others, represent themselves and their interests (...)”. While composing the structure and the content of the definition, the author also took into account the sociology of international relations, sociology of organization, sociology of law, sociology of globalization etc.³⁴ Additionally, some of the contributors to diplomatic studies dwell on issues like diplomacy as profession (professionalization

³² The author got this idea in the summer of 1992 when discussing the concrete topic of his PhD that he enrolled at that time under the mentorship of Dr. Josef Langer, professor of sociology at the University of Klagenfurt, Austria.

³³ Comp. also Jazbec, 2013.a.

³⁴ Ibid.

of diplomacy), gender issues and management in diplomacy. These are typical topics to be explored with the sociological approach.

Before concluding, let us present the discussed issue in the below table. This would enable the reader to get a clear, comprehensive and comparative view upon the authors, their works and scientific fields that have been researching and via facti founding diplomacy ever since.

Table № 1: Selected authors, their works and areas discussing diplomacy³⁵

№	Authors, diplomatic experience	Work, year and diplomatic period	Academic area
1	Thucydides (military experience)	The History of the Peloponnesian War (404 B.C.) – ED	History
2	Nicollo Machiavelli (diplomat)	The Prince (1532) – ED	Political sciences
3	Hugo Grotius (diplomat)	On the Law of War and Peace (1625) – ED/CD	International law
4	Ernest Satow (diplomat)	Guide to Diplomatic Practice (1917) – MD	International relations and diplomatic practice
5	Harold Nicolson (diplomat)	Diplomacy (1939) – MD	International relations and diplomatic practice
6	Geoff Berridge (diplomat)	Diplomacy: Theory and Practice (1995) – PM	Diplomatic studies
7	Christen Jönsson and Martin Hall	The Essence of Diplomacy (2005) – PM	Diplomatic studies
8	Kishan Rana (diplomat)	The 21 st Century Ambassador: Plenipotentiary to Chief Executive (2008) – PM	Diplomatic studies
9	Jean-Robert Leguey-Feilleux	The Dynamics of Diplomacy (2009) – PM	Diplomatic studies
10	Milan Jazbec (Ed.) (diplomat)	Sociology of Diplomacy: Initial Reading (2014) – PM	Sociology of diplomacy

Source: the author

³⁵ Legend – ED (early diplomacy), CD (classical diplomacy), MD (modern diplomacy), PM (postmodern diplomacy). For more on this comp. Jazbec, 2021.

Conclusion

Upon the so far discussion, several conclusions could be made that illustrate the process of scientific perception and elaboration of diplomacy.

Firstly, the whole process from the first discussion on diplomacy within the historical frame till its elaboration with the approach of sociology took approximately two and a half millennium. One could point out ten ground-breaking works that paved the way for this development.³⁶ The first three laid the ground for diplomacy and fixed its understanding as well as form; the codification of diplomacy in both Vienna Conventions rests clearly on this accumulation. They all could be traced within four main periods and forms of diplomacy: in the early diplomacy two works, in the classical diplomacy one work, in the modern diplomacy two works, and in the postmodern diplomacy five works. The trend of appearance of works built steady accumulation of expertise (both of topics and in diversity of disciplines) and faced an exponent progress in the period after the end of the Cold War. The theoretical breakthrough to diplomatic studies occurred just within one decade (from the late eighties to the late nineties). We could state that this process followed structural changes in the historical situation and was straightforward.

Secondly, seven of the contributors (Machiavelli, Grotius, Satow, Nicolson, Berridge, Rana and Jazbec) shared long diplomatic practice, what they managed to transform in theoretical production on their career and its topic, while Thucydides on his part was active for a certain period as a high-ranking military commander.³⁷ Hence, there is a strong impression that practical activity supports significantly theoretical contemplation. Furthermore, Machiavelli, with his insistence on continuous communication between the envoy and his sending authority (instructions and reporting), contributed

³⁶ One could add at least ten additional important and referential works, what would demand a much more extensive discussion (some of them are referred to briefly). However, the author of this paper is of the belief that the discussed ten ones are of prime importance.

³⁷ There are eleven contributors, since Jönsson and Hall produced together their volume (2005).

significantly to the establishment of both way communication that remains till today one of the cornerstones of diplomatic profession. Different to this, Grotius, Satow and Nicolson did not go along with the transition to new forms of diplomacy. Grotius was not fond of the emerging residential diplomacy, while Satow and Nicolson were somehow hesitant with the conceptual transition to modern diplomacy.³⁸ Contrary to this, the here discussed contributors from the period of the postmodern diplomacy fully grasped the momentum and elaborated significantly upon it and deepening it, articulating via this their perception of change.

Thirdly, diplomacy remained to rest throughout the discussed period on observing and reporting as well as on keeping the dialogue (including negotiation as its strong tool). It did, however, made a huge substantial transition from being originally an instrument of the nation state (what it still is today) to the actor of structural influence and of reproducing international community. Shifting its importance, notion and outreach from national to international, i.e. global, marks the decisive move in its so far development. This has also further on cemented its indispensability, since no official international communication is able to exist without diplomacy. Next, personal contact on the ground remains to be vital for the maintenance of relations and dialogue as well as the question of the survival of the global community also demands constant networking.

Last but not least, all these confirms additional food for thought for the increasing number of disciplines within social sciences (and others), discussing diplomacy. It also seems that the emergence of diplomatic studies paved the way as well for sociology to enter strongly the study of diplomacy. At the same time, the whole here discussed evolution approves the long-proven fact that social sciences remain to be the main research frame for contemplating, implementing and use of diplomacy in understanding and managing relations and topics among states and other actors thus keeping to reproduce the international community.

³⁸ This, however, in no case minimizes their outstanding contribution to the development of diplomacy and its elaboration.

CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji
Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana

327
341.7

JAZBEC, Milan, 1956-

Diplomacy and globalization : theorizing, cases and synergies / Milan Jazbec ; [foreword Edislav Manetovic, afterword Eva Jerman]. - 1st print. - Maribor : Kulturni center ; Malta : DiploFoundation, 2023. - (The badger school of diplomacy ; book 1) (Diplomatic press ; 002)

ISBN 978-961-7186-48-2 (Kulturni center Maribor)

COBISS.SI-ID 151158531

The author's personal history can also be read as an ongoing struggle to maintain agency within given historical conditions. By simultaneously pursuing academic and diplomatic careers, he continues to maintain personal agency. This strategy did not only serve him very well, but it equally well enabled him to serve Slovenian students, the Slovene state, and the wider region.

Edislav Manetovic

Diplomacy and Globalisation shows the reader the undeniable intertwining of globalisation and diplomacy and their co-dependence. On one hand, diplomacy is certainly one of the strongest pillars of the world community, on the other hand, however, it is also one of the most flexible ones with a feature of an incredibly fast adaptability to the ever-changing relations within the global society.

Eva Jerman

This book is a compilation of works expressed and shaped by the diplomatic point of view that spreads towards the events and protagonists, moving confidently through the symbolism and representation, pointing towards the lessons that can be learned. It contributes to the social sciences in general but in particular to the not so much explored field of the sociology of diplomacy as an effort to theorize and understand diplomacy within the sociological context.

Natalija Shikova

At the end, a few words in regard of the last segment of the book *Diplomacy and Globalization: Theorizing, Cases and Synergies* dedicated to "Diplomacy and Literature", which deals with six well-known literary works whose plot and main characters contain important elements of the diplomatic profession. Here, too, Jazbec masterfully presents his poetic-writing talent, an erudite in the ranks of Slovenian diplomacy, where he spent all of his professional career.

Dancho Markovski

