



Thesis on sociology of the diplomacy

Prof. Ass. Sabri Kicmari

7-8-21 Koyama Shinagawa

142-0062 Tokyo, Japan

Tel. +818070465476

Email: sabri.kicmari@gmail.com

Japan

ABSTRACT

The establishment of the sociology of diplomacy as an independent discipline is of particular interest to the social sciences. This may occur through more detailed scientific research of diplomacy at the sociological level. To achieve such a goal we need a sociological explanation of the phenomenon of diplomacy and the necessary scientific research procedures, theoretical and empirical, that are based on hermeneutic methods.

Through scientific research in the sociology of diplomacy, there can be obtained empirical data relevant to the processes of communication, negotiation, war, peace, agreements, and disagreements can serve as a basis for guidance for a state representative.

The hermeneutic method of description, understanding, and explanation of the sociological phenomenon of diplomacy creates a good basis for formulating the thesis of a theory of the sociology of diplomacy.

Keywords: Sociology of diplomacy, negotiation, nation, theory, methods.

1. Introduction

Contemporary sociological thought is directed, among other things, at the development of so-called special sociology. Sociology has a special facility for the partial study of social systems or certain areas of social institution actions. Political sociology, sociology of science, sociology of sport, sociology of the family, and sociology of religion are just some of the specialized fields of a contemporary thought of sociology.

Studies of diplomacy have not yet been the object of sociology. Contemporary systems of sociological thinking do not meet the new trend in special sociology-the sociology of diplomacy. It is currently treated in the context of Political Sociology and has not yet been the subject of special scientific research. The aim of this paper precisely is to initiate the establishment of a new discipline of sociology-the sociology of diplomacy.

2. Thesis on sociology of diplomacy

Through diplomacy, there has been created a unique system of communication and actions allowing states to protect their interests in a competitive interstate and international environment (Coplin 1980:256). The diplomatic action goal is to maximize the benefit to the interest of the state, nation, or society. However, maximizing the benefit is not an end in itself. It must be carried out on a rational basis: by taking into account the interests of another state and respect of international norms (Deutsch 1978:165). Only through these principles, is the preservation of peace, its realization (if a conflict has erupted), or avoidance of war, possible.

Here will be used the term thesis to forward a theoretical review of the idea of the sociology of diplomacy through a theoretically summarized statement which is to bring the essence of a complex of statements to its application. In the context of analyzing the relationship between diplomacy and sociology, it

can lead to such scientific conclusions, which would result in the production of a new discipline-the sociology of diplomacy.

Diplomacy should be understood in this case as communicative activities for the protection of national interests, in a process of continuous and intensive communication between governments, nations, and other international entities, to represent and protect the interests of the state, nation, and citizens, aiming to influence attitudes and forms of action of actors in favor of citizens, national and social benefits, or to solve certain problems.

The sociology of diplomacy is a special discipline of sociology that studies social interaction (eg, actors, structures, processes, systems) in the field of diplomacy. Social interaction in diplomacy is conducted between state actors, coded according to international rules, customs, and principles (Andreas 2006: 177). So, the sociology of diplomacy is focused primarily on studying the field of diplomacy, relations between states, and functioning international organizations. It entails both theoretical and empirical dimensions.

The sociology of diplomacy is pretty close to the discipline of political sociology. Political sociology deals with the analysis of social policy prerequisites or structures at certain political order or political action, structure and functions of political institutions, and follows the course of the decision-making processes in politics and the impact of such actions on society (Pappi 2000:535). Dissimilarly, the sociology of diplomacy deals with the analysis of preconditions of interstate actions, structure, and function of the diplomatic institutions and analyses the role that diplomatic service plays in determining the foreign policy of a certain country. Therefore, the discipline of sociology of diplomacy is not only close to the sociology of politics, but also state sociology, political philosophy, sociology of culture, sociology of organization, etc.



The hermeneutic method of description, understanding, and explanation of the sociological phenomenon of diplomacy creates a good basis for formulating the thesis of a theory of the sociology of diplomacy. These can be formulated in the following way:

1. *There is no area in world politics that "has reflected a greater gap between experience and theory than diplomatic statecraft" (Jónsson/Hall 2005: 1). Sociology of diplomacy will lead to the relativism of superficial views and knowledge on the phenomenon of diplomacy (which are full of taboos and prejudices). Sociological research of diplomacy will affect in recognition of scientific sociological mechanisms for negotiation, conflict prevention, and inhibition of interstate conflicts.*

2. *Diplomacy is a social practice, a nested phenomenon. The sociology of diplomacy will enrich sociological theory by examining a specific area of social interaction in contemporary societies that will create new spaces of scientific knowledge.*

3. *It has not been proven that the current political sociology is concerned with diplomacy. It is plausible to analyse the sociological phenomenon of diplomacy as part of the field of political sociology. It is useful to emphasize the sociology of diplomacy in this area.*

4. *Diplomacy is a differentiated activity from other forms of state action with few visible interactions and interpretation processes. Diplomacy is "a timeless, existential phenomenon" (Jónsson/Hall 2005: 3) and the sociology of diplomacy aims to explore diverse forms of action in which diplomacy is exercised. The basic objects of the sociology of diplomacy are the representation of the state, protection, information, and reporting, negotiation and relationships between the states, types of diplomacy, embassies, consulates and missions as diplomatic institutions, their communication with sending and receiving states, their status about international organizations, immunity and privileges, and the phenomenon of localism.*

5. *Sociology of diplomacy can offer a large number of other forms of special sociologic cognition and general sociology. The discipline tracks other special directions of diplomacy of sociology that has to do with interstate communication structures, international norms to establish relations between countries, the role and impact that diplomatic relations have on a country's foreign policy, and political determinations of the host country. A scientific reflection on these segments would be a great help to both the state as an institution and sociology as a science.*

3. Definition and concepts of the sociology of diplomacy

The dimension of diplomacy as a form of communication between countries has existed since the time of its creation. Although this form of communication has continuously changed, it preserved the basic character of the

concept of diplomacy: the establishment of sound relations between the states.

The German philosopher, Walter Benjamin, determined one of the major tasks of diplomacy the case-based peaceful settlements of conflicts on behalf of states. He understood diplomacy as a virtuous task. In his book "Toward the Critique of Violence" Benjamin stipulates that "Only occasionally does the task of diplomats who are mutually interacting with one another consist in the modification of legal orders. In essence, diplomats must, on analogy with the accord between private persons, resolve conflicts peacefully and without contracts, case by case, in the names of their states. A delicate task, which is more resolutely resolved by arbitration, but it is nevertheless a method of resolution that in principle stands higher than any method of arbitration because it is beyond every legal order and therefore beyond violence. In sum, like the interaction among private persons, dealing among diplomats has engendered" (Benjamin 2021: 53).

According to British scholar, Harold Nicolson, the word "diplomacy" derives from the Greek verb "*diploun*", which means "*to fold*". This expression achieved its widespread use during the Roman Empire when all the passports, passes, and vouchers were pressed on double-folded metal plates, folded and connected especially. The naming of these documents was "*diploma*" (Nicolson 2001: 60), while other words such as "*embassy*" and "*ambassador*" in English respectively, the French term "*ambassade*" and "*ambassadeur*" derived from the Latin phrase "*ambactus*" implying "the person in charged (with a mission)".

In today's political and journalistic practice often confusion between the notions of diplomacy and foreign policy occurs. For many, foreign policy is considered as the diplomacy itself or even the diplomacy not as a separate dimension of foreign policy, but as foreign policy as such.

Diplomacy should be understood and seen from two aspects: as an institution and as an activity. Given its uniqueness as an institution, it has to do with the diplomatic service. The Diplomatic Service of an institution is considered a foreign policy mechanism of a state, whose mandate is to protect, represent and negotiate the interests of its state. Considering that the main diplomatic action lines are defined by foreign policy, the diplomatic service is very indirectly implicated in its preparation and determination. Diplomacy as an activity is mainly characterized as an enterprise whose aim is to realize the goals, measures, and programs provided and determined by the country's foreign policymakers (Presidency, Prime Ministry, or Foreign Ministry, depending on the political system setting).

The use of classical forms of defense, negotiation, and representation of state interests are ways that comprise the second characteristic of a state's diplomacy.

Therefore, to understand diplomacy as an important dimension of state actions and to achieve a solid level of analysis on the importance of diplomacy and its activities, an appropriate definition of diplomacy is a must. However, the scientific quest to find a unique definition, overall acceptable, represents a



challenge for scholars or stakeholders interested in diplomacy up to date, since unlimited definitions and perspectives are possible. The concepts of diplomacy vary and a such plurality of views should be understood as a value and not a deficiency. Even today there is no basic, comprehensive, or final concept of diplomacy.

Klaus Schubert and Martina Klein, define diplomacy as "a professional activity, aiming at representing the state interests (economic, cultural, political, military) of one country about the other, performance of preliminary works indispensable for setting the ground to political decisions (external), collection of information's on the foreign countries as well as conveying at the right address (in-country) reactions/messages of the foreign countries" (Schubert / Klein 2006).

A more simplified definition of diplomacy will lead to the conclusion that diplomacy is represented through the form and manner of negotiation between countries. A step further in definition will bring to the conclusion that diplomacy is the way state affairs are managed at the governmental level. Therefore, diplomacy can be defined also as a political process through which political entities first of all, states - regulate their relations in the framework of international norms.

In diplomatic activity, there are at least five notions describing simplistically the duties of a diplomat: representation, defense, friendly relations, information, and negotiation. These five concepts, summarized in the form of diplomatic duties, have found a place in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961. Each definition of the notion of diplomacy, to be comprehensive should be grounded and include these tasks.

Taking into account the characteristics, tasks, and goals of modern diplomacy, post-modern diplomacy could be defined as communication activity to protect state, national and civic interests through the process of continuous and intensive communication between governments, nations, and international entities, applied to represent and defend state interests, or even influencing the viewpoint and attitudes for its country benefit or to find an appropriate solution to certain issues all of which works in the state interest.

For Clausewitz, the war is a continuation of politics by other means. As a result, the military component of a country should remain on alert as if the war will burst tomorrow. The main task of diplomacy is to avert the war, while the task of the diplomat is finding all forms of diplomatic action to avoid the war or terminate it, in case it has outbursted.

The dilemma raised on the reduction of the role of diplomatic missions due to an intensive degree of communication between the foreign ministries may not be taken as a case. The need for intensive communication and daily concern in the diplomatic relations between countries will retain its importance in the activities of diplomatic missions. In this context, in particular, real-time intelligence is important to obtain from diplomatic representations to ongoing developments within the receiving state or about other issues of concern that influence relations between the sending and receiving state.

State interest remains the core of diplomatic actions. This interest is determined by the state's foreign policy. The courses of action in the foreign policy of the state are conditioned by two segments of action: determining the interest and the determination of the manner to achieve these interests. The mechanisms to implement the action plans in the foreign policy of a country are the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its diplomatic service.

Naturally, diplomacy is not a healing medicament. It does not guarantee "eternal peace" as would the German philosopher Immanuel Kant expressed himself. It cannot, in any case, avoid the instrument of self-demonstration of the force of the states that have already made the decision. Therefore, diplomacy should in no way be understood as a need for military defense and weaponry preparation. To this, the Prussian leader Friederich used an interesting expression, which may be applicable even today: Negotiations without weapons are like a symphonic concert without notes.

However, diplomacy is a foreign policy tool, through which a great number of conflicts of interest, that pervade international politics, can be restrained and avoided. Diplomacy may have a human appearance, deals with people, and acts on behalf and for people. At the same time, it is not even similar to pure humanity, morality, and human love. It is even not pacifistic, although its ultimate goal is the establishment of a safe environment. It is a means of state self-determination in a world dominated by state rivals and allied countries.

Diplomacy is a segment of state actions and the actors are state representatives. Their actions have an organic link with the other segments of the state action. They are determined based on political norms and values as defined by the state.

Diplomacy is an interstate activity (a) voluntary, (b) specific, (c) separated, and (d) normative.

a) Establishment of diplomatic relations is a question of will. States cannot be forced to act against their will. Diplomatic relations are established only when state representatives conclude that there is a mutual interest.

b) Diplomatic relations are not guaranteed to be sustainable. The risk of cessation of diplomatic relations is present at all times. There are a variety of reasons that may lead to the suspension or termination of diplomatic relations.

c) Diplomacy is quite a specific activity. Most diplomatic meetings are not published. They are developed among diplomatic representatives on various topics and the public understands only the final results of a negotiation process.

d) Diplomatic activity is based on internationally accepted normative acts. The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961) and the Consular Relations (1963) comprise two main acts based on which are a regulated system of interstate communication and diplomatic action. The principle of reciprocity and priority of international acts before national ones in the relation between states constitutes a basis for action in diplomacy.



The sociology of diplomacy may include three major areas:

1. *Interstate diplomatic relations,*
2. *Negotiation processes, and*
3. *Diplomatic representation functions*

Interstate diplomatic relations The creation of diplomacy as an institutional form of interstate communication results in the importance of interdependency in interstate relations. As the relations between states are very complex and highly complicated, the sociology of diplomacy pays special attention to analyzing reports on mutual recognition, interstate conflict, interstate war, peace, interstate border, etc. Interstate historical and political perspectives can help understand social interaction between actors. For this topic, a very rich literature exists, in the form of memories and in analyzing social interaction between diplomatic actors. The sociology of diplomacy is examining, besides social interaction, the social structures in interstate relations and analyses interactions between state structures and other subjects of international relations.

Negotiation processes-The sociology of diplomacy can play an important role in the scientific treatment of interstate conflict situations, conflict prevention, and peacebuilding in post-conflict environments. Negotiation processes are fundamental mechanisms of action in diplomacy (Berridge 2002: 1). Through negotiation states provide, protect and realize their interests. The negotiating action in diplomacy represents the diplomatic behavior of professional actors oriented by its stakeholders to achieve diplomatic duties. In the process of negotiating, a diplomatic actor should take into consideration the views, beliefs, and interests of the other interactive actor - other state representatives (Berridge 2007:78). He must take into account not only the perceptions and actions of the other representatives but also social norms and values in a predetermined interaction process between two state actors. Therefore, in the context of diplomatic interaction we have to do with social interaction, which is oriented towards other actors, their way of behavior, forecasting the behavior of interactive partners, and their perception after the occurrence. All these interactions are based on certain international norms without giving up the basic principle: the protection of state interests that the diplomat represents.

Diplomatic functions Functions of diplomatic missions are defined in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of the year 1961 and the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 1963. These two conventions establish diplomatic representatives in a particular social position within the area they serve through immunity and privileges. Through the analysis of this phenomenon sociology of diplomacy reaches an important theoretical conclusion about what, how much should be the degree of protection of diplomats and to what extent to extend their privileges.

The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations defines five main functions of diplomacy:

- (a) Representing the sending State in the receiving State;
- (b) Protecting in the receiving State the interests of the sending State and its nationals, within the limits permitted by international law;
- (c) Negotiating with the Government of the receiving State;
- (d) Ascertaining by all lawful means conditions and developments in the receiving State, and reporting thereon to the Government of the sending State; and
- (e) Promoting friendly relations between the sending State and the receiving State, and developing their economic, cultural, and scientific relations (UNO 1961: 95).

Diplomacy should not be taken as a closed and self-acting universe. Moreover, diplomacy constitutes a system based on rules and norms with a political purpose, specified by the country's foreign policy (Hamilton/Langhorne 1995: 240). Even the degree of interaction with the receiving states is determined by the country's foreign policy. This fact makes diplomacy an integral part of the sending state's system, with a specific task and in a specific environment (outside the state).

Diplomacy as an institutional segment includes the operation of norms and values based on a predefined policy by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the sending country (Gyngell/Wesley 2003:9). Bringing an ambassador into a foreign environment and social state is determined, to a large extent, by the rules, claims, and interests of his state, the sending state. At the same time, he is obliged to strictly adhere to international norms, which clearly define his field of actions and degree of immunity and privileges.

Therefore, when we talk about diplomacy as a social institution, we further consider the existence of forms of individual action based on rules and norms set in advance. These rules and regulations are affecting the balance of relations between states.

However, relations between countries are manifold. Among them occur not only friendships and harmonies, but also competition and conflict. Therefore, they are not only normal but may also contain risks and drama.

Diplomacy contains, however, a particular structural approach, compared to other institutions of social action. It is also associated with other institutions through intense communication and interaction. Institutions such as politics, economy, culture, and sport affect the institution of diplomacy, through their interaction, in their specific fields, with similar actors in the receiving state (Wilhelm 2006: 179). However, the degree of influence of these other social actors depends on the degree of interaction with the host country in specific areas and the degree of interstate relations between the sending and the receiving state.



4. Theories of the sociology of diplomacy

The theory of the sociology of diplomacy is based on the following theorists: Niccolo Machiavelli, Hugo Grotius, Ernest Satow, Harold Nicolson, and Henry Kissinger.

Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) is a representative of realism in the theory of sociology of diplomacy. His concepts are uncompromising realism. He pushes for a strong state which would be able to defend itself. Diplomacy he considers is a very important instrument of the state when the Prince "wishes to do great things even he has acquired large armies" (Berridge 200: 11). Machiavelli intricately describes the tasks and functions of an ambassador. He understands that the task of diplomats is to influence the princes of the receiving state in the interests of the sending state. He believes that deceit and betrayal are necessary for negotiations with other states as long as it is in the interest of sending states.

Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) is another representative of realism in the theory of the sociology of diplomacy. In his view, all aspects of relations between countries have to go through international law. In his theoretical system, which is presented in his book "De Jure Belli ac Pacis" he depicts diplomacy as a special role (Grotius 2001: 10). Grotius believes that embassies at all times are helpful, but in wartime more important (Grotius 1964: 442). He recommends negotiation, arbitration, and the lot as three methods for preventing a war (Berridge 2002: 53). All these three methods can be implemented by ambassadors. Grotius considers that the immunity of the ambassador is essential to effectively exercise his functions.

The British diplomat Ernest Satow (1843-1929) is a representative of the idealistic concepts of the theory of the sociology of diplomacy. His works are not only simple memoirs or historical, cultural, and philological studies, but also a sociological analysis of diplomacy. His book "The Guide to Diplomatic Practice" is a classic book on the sociology of diplomacy. Satow is among the first theorists who speak about a "society of civilized nations" (Otte 2002:129). Satow notes the elaboration of the virtues of an ideal diplomat. Unlike Machiavelli, he rejects the view that a diplomat's main weapons are secrecy, deception, evasion, and forgery. Instead, he prefers civilized behavior, peaceful nature, sharp wit, and political ingenuity. An ideal diplomat, according to Satow, should be equipped with virtues of prudence, foresight, penetration, and wisdom, as well as "good nature, good health, and good appearance" (Satow 1979: 183).

Sir Harold Nicolson (1886-1968) is a British theorist who lays his concepts of the ideal diplomat as an important element in the theory of sociology of diplomacy. He is regarded as "one of the few Wilsonian idealists in the British Foreign Office" (Otte 2002: 152). He is against the kind of international diplomacy before First World War, which was called "old diplomacy" or "secret diplomacy", and supports the "new diplomacy" or "democratic diplomacy" based on the concepts of Woodrow Wilson through the expression of his famous "open covenants ..., openly arrived at" (Otte 2002: 157). Nicolson does not consider at all a crafty diplomat, because he could be "an

incredible diplomat is sure it is a dangerous failure" (Nicolson 2005: 110). Nicolson found that an ideal diplomat has to be fitted with seven basic virtues: boldness, accuracy, composure, character, patience, modesty, and loyalty.

Henry Kissinger (*May 27, 1923) - is an American theorist and Former US State Secretary. The theoretical concepts of Kissinger are three kinds: historical, philosophical, and sociological. He represents realist positions in his sociological analysis of diplomacy. His diplomatic actions are based on national interests. Unlike Nicolson, Kissinger favors secret actions in diplomacy. In his political career, he was able to lead successful secret negotiations that led to the end of the Vietnam War, as well as to relax the relations of the US with the Soviet Union and China. He reminds diplomatic actors that "politics is the art of the possible" (Kissinger 1979: 701) and does not concentrate on unilateral diplomatic victory. Instead of unilateral diplomatic victory, he prefers a type of quiet diplomacy and step-by-step diplomatic actions (Otte 2002: 197). In explaining the importance of quick actions, he finds that bureaucratic inertia can be a serious obstacle in the negotiation process. To avoid such obstacles, he prefers secret diplomacy to overcome state bureaucracy. Confidentiality and trust among the parties, according to him, avoid pressures on them.

5. Methods of sociology of diplomacy

The hermeneutic method should be a basic method of the sociology of diplomacy. I see this method as a systematic and practical method to understand diplomatic communication reflectively. In the tradition of hermeneutics as a comprehensive understanding method, the hermeneutic method asks according to the conditions of understanding the actions and communication of diplomatic state representatives (Veraart/Wimmer 2008: 364-367).

To achieve the goal of establishing a sociology of diplomacy, there is a need for a sociological explanation of the phenomena of diplomacy and the necessary scientific research procedures, theoretical and empirical, that is based on the hermeneutic methods of description, understanding and explanation (Mayntz,/Holm /Hübner 2008; and Denzing 2009).

The hermeneutic method of sociological description of diplomacy directs at describing the diplomatic behavior of states, taking into account their political, ideological, economic, and cultural frameworks. The conclusions that can be drawn from the described method previously considered the analytical basis of the phenomenon of diplomacy.

The hermeneutic method of a sociological understanding of the phenomenon of diplomacy aims to understand the behavior of diplomatic actions, and certain acts of state and compare them with international norms and values. This method creates a pattern recognition and interpretation of state actors.

The hermeneutic method of sociological explanation of the phenomenon of diplomacy explains in what way diplomatic state actors work on establishing interstate situations, interstate normative interfaces, and the development of relations between states. Critical analysis of the behavior of state actors is an important part of the scientific method of the sociology of diplomacy.



The goal of the hermeneutic method is to construct the social significance of diplomatic interactions (negotiations, conferences, bilateral meetings) and all kinds of interaction products (agreements, international conventions). This sociological perspective is important to highlight how diplomatic institutions are operating to advance the interests of the state. The actions of diplomatic actors can be understood if they are analyzed in the relevant context for a specific situation leading to the problem. Research interest is oriented on the diplomatic conduct of states through internationally established diplomatic procedures, standards, and rules to advance the interests of the state.

6. Conclusion

The development of a particular discipline of sociology, which is focused on diplomacy, can be based on the following prerequisites: the need for a further expansion of sociology and its disciplines on certain social phenomena such as diplomacy;

diplomatic recognition as a scientific research object; the importance and impact the institution of diplomacy has on nations, states and societies; growing trend of the establishment of the international governmental organizations; and encouragement of the establishment of a sociological analytical school for diplomacy as a phenomenon and institution.

The objects of scientific research in the sociology of diplomacy are diplomatic representations, states, and international organizations. Through scientific research, significant empirical data on the processes of communication, war, peace, negotiation, and disputes, can be obtained which could further serve as a guide for state representatives.

The establishment of a sociology of diplomacy as an independent discipline will be of particular interest to the social sciences. This may occur through more detailed scientific research of diplomacy at the sociological level.

Bibliography

- Benjamin, W. (2021): *Toward the Critique of Violence*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Berridge, G.R. / Keens-Soper, Maurice / Otte, T.G. (2002): *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger*. Hampshire/New York: Palgrave.
- Berridge, G.R. (2002): "Grotius". In: Berridge, G.R. / Keens-Soper, Maurice / Otte, T.G. (2002): *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger*. Hampshire/New York: Palgrave.
- Berridge, Geoff R. (2010): *Diplomacy: theory and practice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coplin, William D. (1980): *Introduction to international politics*. New Jersey Prentice-Hall.
- Denzing, Norman K. (2009): *The research act: a theoretical introduction in sociological methods*. New Jersey: Rutgers.
- Deutsch, Karl W. (1978): *The Analysis of Internal Relations*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Grotius, Hugo (2001): *On the Law of War and Peace* (Lat.: *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*). Ontario: Batoche Books Kitchener.
- Grotius, Hugo (1964): *De Jure Belli ac Pacis (Three books on the Law of War and Peace)*. New York – London: Francis W. Kelsey.
- Gyngell, Allan/Wesley, Michael (2003): *Making Australian Foreign Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamilton, Keith/Langhorne, Richard (1995): *The practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory and Administration*. London: Routledge.
- Jönsson, Christer/Hall, Martin (2005): *Essence of Diplomacy*. Hampshire/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kissinger, Henry (1979): *White House Years*. Washington: Library of Congress.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo (1995): *The prince and other political writings*. London: Everyman's Library.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo (1996): *Discourses on livy*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Mayntz, Renate/Holm, Kurt/Hübner, Peter (2008): *Einführung in die Methoden der empirischen Soziologie*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Nicolson, Harold (2001): *The Evolution of the Diplomatic Method*. Oxford: University of Oxford.
- Nicolson, Harold (2005): *Diplomacia*. Prishtine: Brezi 81.
- Otte, T.G. (2002): *Satow*. In: G.R. Berridge/Maurice Keens Soper/T.G. Otte: *Diplomatic theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger*. New York: Palgrave.



- Otte, T.G. (2002): *Nicolson*. In: G.R. Berridge/Maurice Keens Soper/T.G. Otte: *Diplomatic theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger*. New York: Palgrave.
- Otte, T.G. (2002): *Kissinger*. In: G.R. Berridge/Maurice Keens Soper/T.G. Otte: *Diplomatic theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger*. New York: Palgrave.
- Pappi, Franz (2000): *Politische Soziologie*. In: Holtmann, Everhard (Ed.): *Politik-Lexikon*. München/Wien: Oldenbourg Verlag.
- Satow, Sir Ernest (1979): *The Guide to Diplomatic Practice*. London: Longman; 5th edition.
- United Nations (1961): *Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relation 1961*. Done in Vienna, on 18 April 1961. Entered into force on 24 April 1964. United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 500.
- Veraart, Albert / Wimmer, Reiner (2008): *Hermeneutik*. In: Jürgen Mittelstraß (Ed.): *Enzyklopädie Philosophie und Wissenschaftstheorie*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Wilhelm, Andreas (2006): *Außenpolitik – Grundlagen, Strukturen und Prozesse*. München – Wien: R. Oldenbourg Verlag.