THE EVOLUTION OF DIPLOMACY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES[1]

Milan Jazbec

NOVA University, Slovenia,
milan.jazbec@gmail.com

Abstract
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. 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 focusedresearch of diplomacy that led through theories of international relations, 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. Social sciences remain to be the main research frame for contemplating, implementing and use of diplomacy in understanding and managing relations among international actors.

***Key words**: 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.

[1] Presented as a key note speech at the 3rd International Balkan University Conference "Challenges of the Changing World – Building a Safer Future", June 2021.
[2] Comp. for example Anderson (1993), Barston (2006:1), Berridge (2015), Feltham (1994), Nicolson (1988:3-5), Satow (1994:3), and Watson (1991).

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.[1] A very basic deduction of diplomacy would bring us to only two terms of its defining elements: diplomats observe and report.[2] Everything what diplomats do refers to these two elements 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) determinethe 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.[3] 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.

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.[4] 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 anation 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.[1] 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 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 evolutionthat 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.[2] Hence, also outstanding elaborations on diplomacy, that we dwell on, appeared along those historical changes as a part oftheir intellectual, but also practical driving forces, being in consequent relation with thesechanges.

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 andphilosopher 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 classicalvolume on understanding diplomacy as an issue of international relations and diplomatic practice, connected also to political sciences. Until the turn of the century, a handful of other

[1] Comp. Fukuyama, 2014.

[2] For the change of a paradigm comp. Jazbec, 2006.

works followed that dwelled further on these topics. They are Modern Diplomacy (Barston, 1988), The Pure Concept of Diplomacy (Mahalgaes, 1988), Diplomat's Handbook ofInternational 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.[3] 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 andthe 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 (1999/2015) 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)[4], Multistakeholder Diplomacy: Challenges 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).[5] 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.[6] 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).[7] This primarily theoretical, but alsostrongly 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

[3] 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.
[4] For the purpose of this paper, this volume is of special importance and particular usefulness.
[5] For the order of appearance comp. footnote No 9.
[6] For additional understanding of this process, a highly useful and concise, though brief reference is Murray et al. (2011).
[7] Original edition in Slovene (2012), with expanded and revised edition in English (2014) and translated into Russian, published at the Diplomatic Academy of Ukraine, Kiev (2015).

work from the field concerned.[1] The period of postmodern 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. 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.[2]

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 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

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

[2] For more on Thucydides see https://www.history.com/topics/ancient-history/thucydides

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 the 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).[1] 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,[2] these views show his deep understanding and limits of diplomacy. Henceforth, he "clearly believed that diplomacy must be continuous rather than episodic activity" (ibid., p. 21) with an aim to keep in constant, rapid and secure communication with

[1] 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.
[2] 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".

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).[1] For this to achieve, "full ambassadors [have to be] selected from among the most of distinguishedcitizens 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.[2]

> 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, namelyas Berridge (2001.b: p. 64) 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.[3] 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.

[1] It is important to notice that enemies are in the forefront of diplomatic attention.
[2] 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
[3] Among references on broader understanding of Grotius, one could also list Tuck, 2005.

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.[1] 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.[2] The author is highly detailed, meaning also useful to the same extent, discussing from one point of view commonly known and used topics asprivileges 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 subjectof study at universities and as the diplomatic career (ibid.).

Without a neccessity 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.

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 suchthey present the cornerstone of diplomacy as a profession and of further dwelling on its various

[1] 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).

[2] Additional specifics of this book is that, while written by Satow, later editions were edited by outstanding experts on diplomacy or statecraft.

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.[3] 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 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 (1999) – 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)[4] 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.[5] 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.[6] 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 chief purpose is to enable states to

[3] 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.
[4] Five expanded and updated editions in only a decade and a half.
[5] Content of the third edition, 2005: viii-ix.
[6] Content of the fifth edition, 2015: vii-ix.

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.).[1] 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".[2] 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 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.).[3] 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

[1] Neuhold qualifies it as "demonopolization of foreign ministries" (1992). Comp. also Rana (2008: 9).

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

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

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 sociologyof diplomacy, like the Chapter 2 (Analytical Framework) (comp. Jazbec, 2014.b: 36-41).

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 neccessity 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 inany 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 actorscommunicate, 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 interactionat 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 signof 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)[1]. 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, 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.[2]

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

[1] 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).

[2] 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.

period.[1] 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 studyof 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.).[2]

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.[3] Additionally, some of the contributors to diplomatic studies dwell on issues like diplomacy as profession (professionalization of diplomacy), gender issues and management in diplomacy. These are typical topics to be explored with the sociological approach.

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 groundbreaking works that paved the way for this development.[4] 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 expertize (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).

[1] 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.

[2] Comp. also Jazbec, 2013.

[3] Ibid. ,

[4] One could add at least ten following 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.

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.[5] Hence, there is a strong impression that practical activity supports significantly theoretical contemplation. Furthermore, Machiavelli, with hisinsistence on continuous communication between the envoy and his sending authority (instructions and reporting), contributed significantly to the establishment of both way communication that remains till today one of the cornerstones of diplomatic profession. Differentto 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.[6] 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 thistheir 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.

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

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

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, M. S. (1993). The Rise of Modern Diplomacy. London: Longman.
2. Barston, R. P. (2006). Modern Diplomacy. London: Longman.
3. Benko, V. (1998). Mesto in funkcije diplomacije v razvoju mednarodne skupnosti. In:
4. Jazbec, Milan. 1998. Diplomacija in Slovenci. Celovec: Založba Drava. Pp. 39–58.
5. Benner, E. (2013). Machiavelli's Prince: A New Reading. Oxford University Press.
6. Berridge, G.R. (2001.a). Machiavelli. In: Berridge, G.R., Keens-Soper, M., Otte, T.G. (Eds.). Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger. Houndmills: Palgrave. Pp. 7–32.
7. Berridge, G.R. (2001.b). Grotius. In: Berridge, G.R., Keens-Soper, M., Otte, T.G. (Eds.). Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger. Houndmills: Palgrave. Pp. 50–70.
8. Berridge, G.R., Keens-Soper, M., Otte, T.G. (Eds.). (2001). Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger. Houndmills: Palgrave.
9. Berridge, G. R. (2005). Diplomacy: Theory and Practice. Third edition. Houndmills: Palgrave.
10. Berridge, G. R. (2015). Diplomacy: Theory and Practice. Fifth edition. Houndmills: Palgrave.
11. Berridge, G.R., Keens-Soper, M., Otte, T.G. (Eds.). (2001). Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger. Houndmills: Palgrave.
12. Bjola, C., Kornprobst, M. (2018). Understanding International Diplomacy: Theory, Practice and Ethics. London: Routledge.
13. Burnham, P. (2004). Research methods in politics. New York: Palgrave, Macmillan.
14. Digol. D. (2010). Emerging Diplomatic Elites in Post–Communist Europe: Analysis of diplomats. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag dr. Müller.
15. Feltham, R. G. (1994). Diplomatic Handbook. London: Longman.
16. Fukuyama, F. (2014). Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalisation of Democracy. London: Profile Books.
17. Grotius, H. (2001). On the Law of War and Peace. Kitchener: Batoche Books.
18. Hamilton, K., Langhorne, R. (1995). The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory and Administration. London and New York: Routledge.
19. Howse, R. (2013). Thucydides and Just War: How to Begin to Read Walzer's Just and Unjust Wars. The European Journal of International Law. Vol. 24, No 1, pp. 17–24.
20. Jazbec, M. (2001). The Diplomacies of New Small States: The Case of Slovenia with some comparison from the Baltics. Aldershot: Ashgate.
21. Jazbec, M. (2006). Diplomacy and Security after the end of the cold war: the change of the paradigm. Jahrbuch der Diplomatischen Akademie. Vol. 41, pp. 163–177.
22. Jazbec, M. (Ed.). (2012). Sociologija diplomacije: Izhodišča, okvir in študije primerov. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
23. Jazbec, M. (2013). The Sociology of diplomacy: a general outline with some aspects and dilemmas. Perspectives: review of Central European affairs. Vol. 21, No. 1. Pp. 87–108.
24. Jazbec, M. (Ed.). (2014.a). Sociology of Diplomacy: Initial Reading. Istanbul: Istanbul Kültür University.
25. Jazbec, M. (2014.b). Sociology of Diplomacy from an Idea to a Concept. In: Jazbec, M. (Ed.) Sociology of Diplomacy: Initial Reading. Istanbul: Istanbul Kültür Universitesi.

26. Jazbec, M. (2021). Diplomatic Functions in the 21st Century Diplomacy. In: Journal of Law and Politics 1, pp. 1 – 12.
27. Jönsson, C., Hall, M. (2005). Essence of Diplomacy. Houndmills: Palgrave.
28. Keens-Soper, M. (2001). Wicquefort. In: Berridge, G.R., Keens-Soper, M., Otte, T.G. (Eds.). Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger. Houndmills: Palgrave. Pp. 88–105.
29. Kissinger, H. (1994). Diplomacy. New York: Simon & Schuster.
30. Kurbalija, J., Katrandjiev, V. (Eds.) (2006). Multistakeholder Diplomacy: Challenges and opportunities. Malta, Geneva: Diplo.
31. Leguey-Feilleux, J. R. (2009). The Dynamics of Diplomacy. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
32. Machiavelli, N. (1985). Izabrano djelo I – II. Zagreb: Globus.
33. Mahalgaes, J. C.D. (1988). The Pure Concept of Diplomacy. Westport: Greenwood Press.
34. Mason, J. (2002). Qualitative researching. London: Sage.
35. Melissen, J. (Ed.). (1999). Innovation in Diplomatic Practice. Houndmills: Palgrave.
36. Morgenthau, H. J. (1978). Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
37. Murray, S. et al. (2011). The Present and Future of Diplomacy and Diplomatic Studies. International Studies, No. 13. Pp. 709–728.
38. Neuhold, H. P. (1992). Das österreische Außenministerium vor der Herausforderungen strukturellen Änderungen in Internacionalen System. Wien: Österreisches Institut für Internationale politik.
39. Neumann, I. B. (2012). At Home with the Diplomats: Inside a European Foreign Ministry. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.
40. Nicolson, H. (1988). Diplomacy. Washington: Georgetown University.
41. Otte, T.G. (2001.a). Satow. In: Berridge, G.R., Keens-Soper, M., Otte, T.G. (Eds.). Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger. Houndmills: Palgrave. Pp. 125–150.
42. Otte, T.G. (2001.b). Nicolson. In: Berridge, G.R., Keens-Soper, M., Otte, T.G. (Eds.). Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger. Houndmills: Palgrave. Pp. 151–180.
43. Otte, T.G. (2001.c). Kissinger. In: Berridge, G.R., Keens-Soper, M., Otte, T.G. (Eds.). Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger. Houndmills: Palgrave. Pp. 180–210.
44. Paterson, W. E. (1969). Small States in International Politics. In: Cooperation and Conflict 4 (1969), pp. 119 – 125.
45. Rana, K. S. (2008).The 21st Century Ambassador: Plenipotentiary to Chief Executive. Malta, Geneva: DiploFoundation.
46. Satow, E. (1994). Satow's Guide to Diplomatic Practice. London: Longman.
47. Sen, B. (1988). Diplomat's Handbook of International Law and Practice. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
48. Sharp, P. (2005). Preface. In: Jönsson, C., Hall, M. Essence of Diplomacy. Houndmills: Palgrave. P. ix.
49. Sharp, P. (2009). Diplomatic Theory of International Relations. New York: Cambridge University Press.
50. Thucydides. (1956). History of the Peloponnesian War. London: William Heinemann, and Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
51. Tuck, R. (ed.). (2005). Introduction. In: Tuck, R. (ed.). The rights of War and Peace: Book I. Hugo Grotius. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, pp. ix – xxxiii.

52. Watson, A. (1991). Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between States. London: Routledge.

53. Internet sources
54. http://www.britannica.com/biography/Hugo-Grotius (06.07.2021)
55. https://www.history.com/topics/ancient-history/thucydides (05.07.2021)
56. http://www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/grotius (06.07.2021)