

Isaac Asimov's Foundation Trilogy and its Perception of Diplomacy: *Envoys, Protocol, Talks*

Milan Jazbec¹

ABSTRACT

The paper innovatively discusses the appearance of diplomacy as an activity in the classical science fiction work *The Foundation Trilogy* by Isaac Asimov. It focuses on the way the author perceives diplomacy and what are lessons learned for small states in the contemporary international society. The methods used are analysis, comment, comparison and interpretation as well as observation with one's own participation. Diplomacy is present in the Trilogy from two points of view. Firstly, by direct mentioning – protocol, negotiation, representation and diplomatic reporting. It is pursued by ambassadors and ad hoc envoys, the latter also holders of high political offices. Secondly, the author creates a variety of circumstances that demand the use of diplomacy. Planets, solar and stellar system and empires exercise relations, fight wars, negotiate, and conclude agreements; that's what diplomacy is for. Small states could learn that they should stick to multilateral institutional engagement and also negotiate for their own interests within it. The way the Trilogy is written, would hardly do without diplomacy – such a case would weaken its literature narrative.

KEY WORDS: diplomacy, science fiction, Asimov, the Foundation Trilogy, envoys

POVZETEK

Prispevek izvorno obravnava pojavnost diplomacije kot dejavnosti v klasičnem delu znanstvene fantastike, v Trilogiji o Galaktičnem carstvu Isaka Asimova. Osredotoča se na način, kako avtor Trilogije razume diplomacijo in kakšni so njegovi nauki za delovanje malih držav v sodobni mednarodni skupnosti. V članku uporabljamo naslednje metode: analiza, komentar, primerjava in interpretacija ter opazovanje z lastno udeležbo. Diplomacija je v Trilogiji prisotna z dveh vidikov. Prvič, z direktnim navajanjem – protokol, pogajanja, predstavljanje in diplomatsko poročanje. Izvajajo jo veleposlaniki in ad hoc odposlanci, slednji so tudi politiki na visokih položajih. Drugič, avtor Trilogije ustvarja različne okoliščine, ki zahtevajo uporabo diplomacije. Planeti, ozvezdja in galaktični sistemi ter imperiji v Trilogiji izvajajo medsebojne odnose, borijo se v vojnah, se pogajajo in sklepajo sporazume; za to pa je potrebna diplomacija. Male države se lahko iz tega

1 ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Milan Jazbec, PhD, Professor of Diplomacy, and Ambassador of Slovenia to Macedonia. Former Ambassador of Slovenia to Turkey (2010 – 2015, accredited to Azerbaijan, Iran, Iraq, Syria and Lebanon) and State Secretary at the Slovene Ministry of Defence (2000 – 2004). Email: milan.jazbec@gmail.com

naučijo, da naj bodo članice multilateralnih aranžmajev ter da se morajo tudi znotraj njih pogajati za uresničitev svojih interesov. Način, kako je Trilogija napisana, bi težko bil brez diplomacije – menimo, da bi tak pristop zmanjšal vrednost zgodbe kot take.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: diplomacija, znanstvena fantastika, Asimov, Trilogija o Galaktičnem carstvu, odposlanci

INTRODUCTION

Diplomacy is a profession dedicated to solving disputes among states by peaceful means. This could be a very condensed and brief definition of the term, which we use in this article as a research starting point as well as a conceptual framework. The particularity of our approach lies in the fact that we focus our attention on one of the greatest science fiction works ever, namely on the Isaac Asimov's achievement *The Foundation Trilogy*. We stem from the preposition that intersection between diplomacy and literature could tell us more about both, i.e. diplomacy as activity and literature classics, and would also consequently produce better and wider understanding of the both of them.

There are two research questions, which we try to answer in the paper. Firstly, how does the distinguished author present and perceive diplomacy in his monumental work, and secondly, what can diplomats of small states in the EU learn from this work for their states' diplomatic performance at the beginning of the 21st Century. Methods, used for this research effort, include analysis, comments, comparison and interpretation as well as – since the author is a career diplomat – the method of observing with one's own participation. From one point of view we remain at a general level of analysis, following main trends and trying to reach some general conclusions, while from another one we go in concrete examples. With this we try to illustrate not only understanding of particular aspects of diplomatic endeavour, but also of general trends in presenting diplomacy in a newly discovered context of appearance, namely that of science fiction literature.

DIPLOMACY AND LITERATURE

There are numerous definitions of diplomacy, which do not contradict each other, but rather complement them.² One could understand diplomacy as a skill, negotiation, communication, mission, organization, foreign policy, activity, tool etc.³

Our understanding of diplomacy in this text focuses on diplomacy as activity what includes various aspects, like in particular negotiation, protocol, communication and dependence on a concrete social and

2 Benko, 1998: 39.

3 Comp. Anderson, 1993, Benko, 1998, Berridge, 2005, Feltham, 1994, Jazbec, 2009, Nicolson, 1988, Petrič, 2010, Satow, 1994 etc.

historical context. Negotiation has been understood as a basis of diplomacy ever since (Nicolson, 1988: 3–5, and Satow, 1994: 3); also protocol, although not that much directly obvious (Ibid.), while understanding it as a communication (process) is more of a recent origin (Petrič, 2010: 307–341). The same goes for uncovering the relation between a concrete form and mode of diplomacy and a given historical situation in the function of which it is (Benko, 1998: 40). This would mean that one can “on the whole understand diplomacy as a dynamic *social process*, which enables foreign policy communication among subjects of international public law, and depends primarily on the changing social situation within a given historical context and is in principal relation towards the nation state” (Jazbec, 2013: 70). Hence, it would also clarify why we can distinct, for example, between classical and modern diplomacy, which both are a result of two different, although within far from being compact, historical periods.

Protocol is perhaps that aspect of diplomacy by which it is most commonly perceived and understood, be it in the media, daily discussions or general literature. This understanding usually includes seeing diplomacy as a fashionable behavior and approach to people as well as a skill in style, manner and attending social events. It is an impression, which builds upon an outside/surface perception of diplomacy and diplomats, without going deeper into its methods, structures and substance. Connected to this is the importance of words and symbols in diplomatic engagement. Both could be seen as a direct result of the first diplomatic function, which is “representing the sending state in the receiving state” (Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, article 3/a).⁴

A diplomat is already representing his⁵ own country, i.e. the sending state in the receiving state, when not having done anything special, particular – it is enough just to appear there and the appearance (behavior and outfit) as such already produces messages of representation. It would mean that a diplomat is already doing his job without doing anything particular, i.e. *nothing*. And those messages contain on a symbolical, but also on a practical level his attitude (and via that of his

4 Other four are: protecting in the receiving State the interests of the sending State and its nationals, within the limits permitted by international law; negotiating with the Government of the receiving State; ascertaining by all lawful means conditions and developments in the receiving State, and reporting thereon to the government of the sending State; promoting friendly relations between the sending State and the receiving State, and developing their economic, cultural and scientific relations.

5 We use in the paper masculine form in a neutral meaning, unless otherwise specified.

country, the sending state) towards the receiving state, respect, appreciation, courtesy and good wishes – as much of everything as it is possible to decode from pure act of representation. Additional messages are being produced by a diplomat when he starts going around, speaking, discussing, i.e. *doing* things, performing his job. Therefore, diplomat is performing his duty already when he is not doing anything, just being there. This is a special characteristic of his mission that makes it so demanding and responsible. Sometimes, a diplomat can spoil or harm the relation also with a gesture he might not be (but must not be) unaware of it, while good relations are always a result of years of sensitive work and engagement. For this reason, one often hears how diplomats always exaggerate in their behaviour and addressing to a certain extent. And when they do not want to tell anything specific, nothing particularly good, they remain on a level of ordinary politeness – not to harm, but still to send an appropriate message.⁶ Or to put it additionally: “... the ambassador needs to control his body, his gestures, his movements through space, and his language, and to monitor the relationship between them” (Hampton, 2009: 8). Hence, this might be the appropriate place to mention characteristics of a good diplomat or, as Nicolson puts it, the qualities of an ideal diplomat (1988: 55–67): trust, accuracy, calm, patience, good temper, modesty and loyalty as well as intelligence, knowledge, discernment, prudence, hospitality, charm, industry, courage and tact. Good diplomats always stand out. This commandment is even more – one could say crucially – important for diplomats of small states. Those states, in particular when speaking about new small ones, are perceived as vulnerable, less influential, with limited resources and limited outreach, but they could be highly flexible and adaptable to changes and easily develop niche strategies.⁷ It is therefore naturally that small states tend to be members of international organizations, where they can accelerate their performance: “Usually, international institutions are the best friends of small states” (Väyrynen, 1997: 42). The European integration process, which gained on structural speed after the end of the Cold War, is a primary example of this. Diplomats of those states have to be highly educated and skilled, since they can not rely on big diplomatic machineries with long institutionalized memory and diplomatic archives.

Symbols are of an unprecedented importance for diplomacy and diplomats, “[F]or diplomacy is the *symbolic* political act par excellence”

6 Comp. Jazbec, 2006.a: 92–103.

7 More on new and small states in Jazbec, 2001: 36–76.

(Hampton, 2009: 5). Through an act of diplomatic communication those symbols, those signs are being exchanged, what would mean that “[D]iplomacy involves making *meaning* (italics M. J.) out of signs produced by a rival or an adversary” (Ibid.). This is the very reason why communication, which is exercised by diplomats with a purpose to solve disputes by peaceful means, has to be a continuous process: “... to negotiate ceaselessly, overtly or secretly, everywhere ... is necessary to the health of States” (Richelieu, 1990: 51, quoted in Hampton, 2009: 3). We stated that diplomats produce symbols and via them they express themselves. This should be narrowed, having in mind the person of the performer by himself: it is the envoy that does this job, or the ambassador. The former when we speak either on a general level or within terms of special missions, and the latter when we speak about resident diplomacy.⁸

It is the era of a great transformation of diplomacy from early to the classical one, when literature got interested in diplomacy on a large scale.⁹ One usually takes period from fifteenth to seventeenth century, with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 as a turning point, when classical diplomacy was established.¹⁰ It brought into diplomatic practice two decisive innovations, which remain of key importance till nowadays: residential diplomatic missions and a two way communication between the sending authority and its diplomatic mission. They revolutionized diplomatic practice and its exercising, made relations and their performance more complex and demanding but also more efficient as well started to produce immense body of constant diplomatic written reporting. And, consequently, diplomacy as a topic, sporadically or primarily, started to appear in classical literature work, from the eighteenth century on mainly in novels, not only in the work of epics. Diplomacy became housed in “the rise of modern secular literary culture” (Hampton, 2009: 1) and has attracted authors to include it in their narrative (comp. Uthmann, 1985: 7–11).

Literature is always at least partially a reflection of a certain time, be it its own or any other as well (Trdina, 1974: 200). Authors also like to move to past times to reflect their present and sometimes they move

8 Strictly speaking, it would be possible to claim that it is only the ambassador that represents the sending state in the receiving state, while the rest of the staff of the mission supports him in performing this diplomatic function (comp. Feltham, 1994: 17–18). Although it should be mentioned that the current diplomatic practice is much more flexible as far as protocol and other diplomatic tasks are concerned.

9 We see the development of diplomacy in four phases: early, classical, modern and postmodern. (Jazbec, 2006.b and 2009: 31–51).

10 Comp. Anderson, 1993, Benko, 1997, Hampton, 2009, Jazbec, 2009 etc.

in distant future to do the same, too. This also holds true for science fiction literature: it's not merely about travel in space and time, with all corresponding narrative, but primarily about human aspects that such travel brings upon the reader. As the word tells, this dwelling is framed with both science and fiction, which produce the reflection of an imaginary or possible reality.¹¹ It is the combination of both parts that make the equilibrium in which the best results could be reached.¹² Literature on a whole reflects and portrays reality in a way that educates and entertains the reader, since "... each novel had to introduce its readers a new world" (Mullan, 2006: 9). This could be achieved so "... that [they] told new stories rather than recomposing old ones" (Ibid.). Those books "...that readers keep rereading..." (Ibid., 2) enter classic.¹³ Some effect by their content, some by their style or by a combination of both, although "A novel absorbs us, I would say, not because of what it is about, but because of how it is written" (Ibid., 6). A reader gets to know through the reflection something more of the reflected topic, but it is also the other way around: he gets familiar with the knowledge of the author about the reflected topic, too. This is very important for our discussion, since "the perception of diplomacy is mixed and sometimes confusing" (Kurbalija, 2000: 7). There is, however, no guarantee that after reading literature, which also deals with diplomacy, such impression could be get rid of. Nevertheless, our intention in this paper is to search for aspects of diplomacy in the Asimov's Trilogy and try to interpret it.

THE FOUNDATION TRILOGY

Though not the beginner of the genre, Isaac Asimov marks it with his vast and innovative opus and has long ago become one of its classics.¹⁴ Among his works The Foundation Trilogy presents his first grand complete of science fiction works. As a result of his separate story writings in the 1940s, "it is not a trilogy" (Gunn, 1988: i), but "a series of nine stories" (Ibid.), which were later put together, published as a trilogy and "[T]he World Science Fiction Convention of 1966 voted them 'the

11 Among many referential works on the genre one could point out James and Farah (2003), and Mann (2001).

12 It is widely known that for example both the term and the product *robot* are an invention of science fiction, namely of Isaac Asimov (1950).

13 Without going into any details, it is also widely known that in particular two names stand out as classics in the science fiction literature: Isaac Asimov and Arthur C. Clarke, whatever the order of appearance.

14 As the beginners one could name Mary W. Shelley (Frankenstein) and George H. Wells (The Time Machine). As for the classics, one could name Robert A. Heinlein, Isaac Asimov, Ray Bradbury and Arthur C. Clarke. (Wolfe, 2007: xix)

greatest all-time science-fiction series'." (Ibid.).¹⁵ The three parts of the Trilogy are *Foundation*, *Foundation and Empire*, and *Second Foundation* (all published in the first part of 1950s).¹⁶ For our research it is essential to know that stories (and the Trilogy itself) were published a decade before (and written even earlier) both Vienna Conventions (on Diplomatic as well as on Consular Relations) were agreed upon and entered into force. This is important to bear in mind, since it means that Asimov, was he or was he not reading anything on diplomacy while writing stories, could not have got a comprehensive and codified view upon diplomacy, which both Conventions brought.

The story behind *Foundation* "is a saga" (Ibid.). What are the dimensions of this saga? Firstly, each part tells a fascinating story in which ingenious men and women cope with the problems in the far future, but for which they find solutions by using reason instead of super-human talents or exotic technology. Secondly, Asimov writes about a future that reminds us of our own world and its problems. Thirdly, daring individuals challenge traditional ways of doing things while conservative politicians try to stop them. Fourth, the solution that so happily solves the problems of one story frequently becomes the cause of the conflict in the next.¹⁷ In particular the first two points are worth pointing out as also one of the most typical, defining elements of the genre: finding solutions by using reason instead of *deus ex machina* and reflecting author's own world in an imaginative reality, usually in the far away place and time, both combined with the frame of un-invented technology that is still possible to imagine as an extrapolation of the existing scientific knowledge.

What definitely makes Trilogy an outstanding literary achievement in terms of the genre, is it's scope: "Asimov gives us a galaxy with millions of inhabited planets, a theory of psychohistory that promises a bright future but implies restricted freedom of choice, a mutant who defies both psychohistory and the Seldon Plan, and a mysterious Second Foundation that must keep its location secret if the Plan is to succeed."¹⁸

15 Those nine stories were written during the 1940s as separate stories, only later they were put together in a form of trilogy. They originally comprise nine stories, five of the novelettes and four of them novellas.

16 More than three decades later, being encouraged by the publisher Doubleday, Asimov wrote additional parts: *Foundation's Edge* (1982), *The Robots of Dawn* (1983), *Robots and Empire* (1985), *Foundation and Earth* (1986), *Prelude to Foundation* (Grafton Books, 1988) and *Forward the Foundation* (Spectra, 1993 – published posthumous). In them he brought together narratives from the *Foundation* story and from his saga on robots. Nevertheless, "[T]he only books you really need on your shelf are the first three" (Darlington, 2011: 12).

17 Comp. the Collector's Note to the Easton Press Collector's Edition (1988.a).

18 Ibid.

There are “twenty-five million inhabited planets in the Galaxy” (Asimov, 1988.a: 9) with nearly “quintillion human beings” (Ibid., p. 25) and only Trantor with “a population of over forty billions” (Ibid.).¹⁹ It is the future, in which “humanity has expanded outward into the galaxy without encountering aliens and created a galactic empire that falls because of its size or corruption or communication problems or the inevitable cycles of history” (Gunn, 1988: i) and in that distant future “even the origin of humanity has been forgotten” (Ibid.). The whole story is developed around the galactic empire, which rises and falls and where, after 12.000 years of its existence, a psychohistorian by name Hari Seldon tries to predict future crisis and ways to solve them to shorten the time of crisis from millennia to centuries. Parts (stories) that follow aim to present and narrate how in different periods and places protagonists were trying to deal with crises, while the Empire was slowly disintegrating. The Empire’s central authority has therefore to deal, discuss and negotiate, but occasionally also to involve in wars with different parts of the empire during the period of turbulence. This is the starting point where and why we see the possibility of diplomacy being included in the text.

In addition to this, Asimov gives his own explanation where the idea for the galactic empire came from – he was accidentally inspired by the rise and the fall of the Roman Empire.²⁰ The explanation offers us the background for our research: the Roman Empire wasn’t maintaining diplomacy towards the outside world, but was exercising it with its different constituting parts, within its broad, big and complicated structure. Hence, from one point of view the Roman Empire was including “all known ancient world western from Persia, with Egypt, Greece, Malta, Asia Minor, Syria, northern Africa, Spain, France, Britain etc.” (Benko, 1997: 26–27). And from another one, that world was “an united political system, which did not allow any parallel independent and equal political units with which it would maintain international relations” (Ibid., 27) and was therefore “primarily an example of a world government and not also of an international society” (Ibid.). But still, “Rome helped to shape European and contemporary practice and

19 Krugman (2012: xiv) finds here one of the flaws: “Then there’s Trantor, the world completely covered in metal because its 75 million square miles of land surface area must bear 40 billion people. Do the math, and you realize that Trantor as described has only half the population density of New Jersey, which wasn’t covered in metal the last time I looked out my window. But these are, as I said, nerdy concerns.”

20 »I had an appointment to see Mr. Campbell to tell him the plot of a new story I was planning to write, and the catch was that I had no plot in mind, or the trace of one. I therefore tried a device I sometimes use. I opened a book at random and set up free association, beginning with whatever I first saw. (...) I thought of soldiers, of military empires, of the Roman Empire – of a Galactic Empire – aha!” (1988.b: vii) “When he reached Campbell’s office, he told the editor that he was planning to write a story about the breakup of the Galactic Empire.” (Gunn, 1988: iii)

opinion about the state, about international law and especially about *empire* (italics M. J.) and the nature of imperial authority” (Watson, 2009: 94). With these characteristics in mind we start our exact research endeavour.²¹

THE PERCEPTION OF DIPLOMACY IN THE FOUNDATION TRILOGY

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Since Asimov got his inspiration for the Trilogy in the late Roman Empire period (structure, development and break up), in particular in time of its disintegration, we could take as a starting point the phase and form of early diplomacy, primarily with its emphasis on negotiations (prior, during or after wars), sending and receiving ad hoc envoys, and correlation between trade activities and growing demand for protection of trade interests (comp. Jazbec, 2009: 35–36). However, we would keep in mind broader understanding of diplomacy for the research. Asimov (1988.a: 54) presents us with the golden rule of diplomacy quite at the beginning, through the statement by the mayor of Terminus Salvor Hardin: “Violence, came the retort, ‘is the last refuge of the incompetent’”. This would also be a general starting point why diplomatic skills are useful in various environments, not necessarily only in performing state affairs and not necessarily only by diplomats. The evolution of diplomatic holders of this activity goes, as Nicolson claims (1988: 10) that way: “Even as the orator type replaced the primitive herald type, so also did the orator give way to the trained observer.” Later on, in the second part of the 20th century, as modern diplomacy enriches the variety of tools and actors, also apart professional diplomats, more and more experts enter diplomatic arena, primarily for a limited period of time, what is becoming an increasing trend.

Let us start with a general remark of how different is the legal status of different worlds within the Galactic Empire. When coming to its center, the planet Trantor, a young mathematician, Gaal Dornick by name, who later proves to be one of the most important aides of Hari Seldon, needs a visa to enter the capital: “He had to open the visa, look again, before he remembered the name” (Asimov, 1988.a: 11). Not much lat-

21 Methodologically speaking, we dwell on different topics, reflecting diplomacy, as they – to our mind – appear in the text of the Trilogy (and mark them with subtitles in the following chapter) and do not necessarily follow the text from its beginning to the end. This means that quotations from the Trilogy will follow topics discussed and will not run through the text as such. Additionally, we are highly selective in picking up examples from the text, which is highly extensive – the 1998 edition, which we use, has 510 marked pages (Foundation, pp. 7–169, Foundation and Empire, 175–342, Second Foundation, 347–510).

er, when he finds himself in trouble, he feels the need to remind the official of his citizenship: "Wait. I have a right to a lawyer. I demand my rights as an Imperial citizen" (Ibid., 20). Entering the capital of the Galactic Empire should presuppose such precautionary procedures: "There were the hundred cross-examinations (...) – and finally the question of the identity cards and visitor's visa" (Ibid., 227).

Asimov (Ibid., 199) is also very clear on showing that the supreme leader/ruler needs trustful diplomats: "I need a man out there; one with eyes, brains, and loyalty." It's loyalty that shows sometimes (residential) ambassadors are not the ones trusted, but (ad hoc) envoys: "... for some other reason they [the *signoria*] did not wish to send real ambassador. The chancellors sent on such missions were not called ambassadors or orators, but envoys (*mandatari*)" (Berridge, 2001: 8). One could say trust is a reflection of a need for secret, classified information, be it forwarded in an oral or written form: "The mayor placed his arms around his neck and said suddenly, "Start talking about the situation at Anacreon!" The ambassador frowned and withdrew the cigar from his mouth. He looked at it distastefully and put it down. Well, it's pretty bad" (Asimov, 1988.a: 71). Diplomats observe and report, it is part of their core mission, but they should gain information by legal means: "Mallow breathed deeply, "As a spy?" "Not at all. As a trader – but with your eyes open" (Ibid., 122).²²

Asimov (Ibid., 224) offers an example of a diplomatic report (dispatch or depeche), which the Emperor's envoy sends to the Military Governor:

FROM: AMMEL BRODRIG, ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY OF HIS IMPERIAL MAJESTY, PRIVY SECRETARY OF THE COUNCIL AND PEER OF THE REALM.

TO: BEL RIOSE, MILITARY GOVERNOR OF SIWENNA, GENERAL OF THE IMPERIAL FORCES, AND PEER OF THE REALM. I GREET YOU.

PLANET # 1120 NO LONGER RESISTS. THE PLANS OF OFFENSE AS OUTLINED CONTINUE SMOOTHLY. THE ENEMY WEAKENS VISIBLY AND THE ULTIMATE ENDS IN VIEW WILL SURELY BE GAINED."

This example could be understood as a typical diplomatic (or military) report – brief, concise, with the full name and title of the sender and receiver;²³ it is also written in block letters, according to the diplomat-

²² Comp. the third diplomatic function, Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Article 3/a.

²³ However, in a routine diplomatic correspondence between the residential diplomatic mission and the foreign ministry, there are no full titles and names, only the abbreviations of the receiving departments and the surname of the head of the mission. This is a clear visual difference between professional diplomatic reporting and that of the ad hoc envoys.

ic manner.²⁴ Its wording is almost a coded one and understood only to those who need to know it. It also lets the reader know full titles of high officials included in the communication: since the sender is the second person in the Galactic Empire and the receiver the General of the Imperial Forces, this dispatch must also have an utmost political, not only diplomatic and military meaning and importance. But it could also be the other way round: “It says nothing”, ground Barr” (Ibid.). Diplomatic correspondence of an ad hoc envoy could be part of political games, in particular since high ranking envoys are part of the top governmental and in particular political circles, what is not the case with the routine reporting of professional diplomats and of their status. Reporting, not only diplomatic, but also within high governing hierarchy, does not always contain everything (Ibid., 267): “How do you mean, not in the reports?” said Indbur, stupidly. “How could – “. This happens primarily for security reasons: “Any report I write goes up through some twenty-odd officials, gets to you, and then sort of winds down through twenty more. That’s fine if there’s nothing you don’t want kept secret” (Ibid.). So one should not wonder if “my dispatches are not detailed” (Ibid., 276).

Diplomacy is an off the record activity. It means off stage activities and approach, therefore diplomats operate with “the fine tradition of caution” (Nicolson, 1988: 77). This would primarily mean that diplomats engaged in state affairs usually stay unknown for broader public (Osolnik, 1998: 139). It is exactly the manner in which Asimov concludes his Trilogy (Asimov, 1988.a: 510): “... but now there was a somber satisfaction on the round and ruddy face of Preem Palver – First Speaker.” The reader learns in the very final sentence of the *Magna Work* of science fiction that the person who helped Arcadia avoid police control at the Kalganian Airport (discussed later as diplomatic immunity case) and the person who was imprisoned by the Kalganian forces and was calling upon his diplomatic immunity (also discussed later), was the most important person of the Second Foundation, staying behind crucial deeds with which the Second Foundation stayed undiscovered and saved. He was not only its leader, but also a top diplomat.²⁵ Asimov ends his work in a grand style, paying – on purpose or not – a tribute to diplomacy.

24 This remark proves the use of the research method of observing with one’s own participation (Gilli, 1974).

25 Top leaders by definition represent their state, hence they are also diplomats. They don’t deal with this activity professionally, but it is part of their function. Therefore, we also speak about summit diplomacy. Comp. Feltham, 1994, Jazbec, 2009, Satow, 1994 etc.

DIPLOMATIC NEGOTIATION

As we stated earlier in this paper, negotiations are one of the most known, significant and oldest parts of diplomacy as an activity, forming the third out of five functions of diplomatic missions. Negotiation means a process of persuading one side of the acceptance of the positions of the other side, until the latter convinces the former about its right; a process that is full of changing dynamics, positions, approach in speaking, gesticulating and pretending.²⁶ This brings us also to the fact that persuasion as an act as well as a process could be the very essence of diplomacy (Kurbalija, 2013).

Diplomatic language is polite and cautious, since no side would like to be close to offensive when expressing wishes, demands or even an ultimate. Such a move would spoil the atmosphere and harm the result. At the end, negotiation process results in a kind of a proper agreement between the involved parties. The language of a document could also vary, depending on intentions, ambitions, expectations and the ability/possibility of interpretation.

After Lord Dorwin, Chancellor of the Empire, left Terminus, the home planet of the Foundation and the Encyclopedists, its mayor Salvor Hardin, presents the Board of the Encyclopedia, with the analysis of the Lord's diplomatic articulation. Firstly, the analysis of the agreement between the Empire and the rebellion kingdom of Anacreon: "As you see, gentlemen, something like ninety percent of the treaty boiled right out of the analysis as being meaningless, and what we end up with can be described in the following manner: Obligations of Anacreon to the Empire: *None!* Powers of the Empire over Anacreon: *None!*" (Asimov, 1988.a: 52).²⁷ And secondly, the analysis of his discussions with the Board: "Lord Dorwin, gentlemen, in five days of discussions *didn't* say one *damned thing*, and said it so you never noticed. *There* are the assurances you had from your precious Empire" (Ibid., 53). And the conclusion that the mayor reached about the high authority: "I'll admit I had thought his Lordship a most consummate donkey when I first met him - but it turned out that he was actually an accomplished diplomat and a most clever man" (Ibid.). Also his behavior, while talking, was carefully crafted out: "Then, too, he spoke in over-precise statements (...) Oh, yes, the elegant gestures of one hand with which he

26 Comp. Berridge, 2005, Kovačević, 2004, Nicolson, 1988, Satow, 1994 etc.

27 During his discussions with the Board, the Lord himself was claiming the other way round. (Asimov, 1988.a: 50).

accompanied his remarks and the studied condescension with which he accompanied even a simple affirmative” (Ibid., 47).²⁸

Prior to that visit, there came Anselm haut Rodric, the Sub-prefect of Puema and Envoy Extraordinary of his Highness of Anacreon, to discuss and persuade dr. Lewis Pirenne, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Foundation and a personal representative of the Emperor, the offer of the neighbouring world kingdom of Anacreon to protect Terminus from its another neighbouring kingdom Smyrno.²⁹ Being present at the discussion, the mayor of Terminus Hardin interrupts highly polite and generally phrased dialogue by saying: “Let’s put it into language” (Ibid., 41). He wants a clear articulation, not mere diplomatic wording that hardly says anything concrete and – even more important – which is, hence, much more difficult to oppose than a clear statement. The turn of the course of the negotiation is immediate: “The envoy paused and added uncomfortably: ‘Well, gentlemen, we’ll pursue the subject tomorrow. You’ll excuse me – (Ibid., p. 42). The mayor explains to the astonished Chairman what he did: “I merely gave him rope and let him talk” (Ibid.). It is an illustrative example of the line of the negotiation process and its dynamics.

Asimov dedicates one full chapter to the diplomatic conference, discussing matters of war and coalition (Chapter 16. Conference, part Two of the Trilogy – Foundation and Empire; Ibid., 270–276). His description is detailed, illustrative and insightful in procedures, behavior of participants and on the elementary protocol matters (place of conference, atmosphere, reporting), but at the same time he does not dwell too much on details.³⁰

He comments rather clear on main organizational elements, dealing with equal treatment, prestige and pride: “It is not enough to fix in advance such details as method of voting, type of representation – whether by world or by population. These are matters of involved political importance. It is not enough to fix matters of priority at the table, both council and dinner; those are matters of involved social importance” (Ibid., 270). So what, then, remains to be settled down? The place, of course: “It was the place of meeting – since that was a matter

28 This remark could already be a part of the Protocol section, although it marks the art of negotiation process in a highly illustrative way.

29 The negotiation was actually an ultimate from the Envoy, but skillfully outmaneuvered by the mayor Hardin (Asimov, 1988.a: 38–43).

30 For a clear and concise guide to conference diplomacy/conference management comp. Feltham, 1994: 139–148.

of overpowering provincialism. And in the end the devious routes of diplomacy led to the world of Radole, which some commentators had suggested at the start for logical reason of central position" (Ibid.). But it is not only this: "Radole was a small world – and, in military potential, perhaps the weakest of the twenty seven. That, by the way, was another factor in the logic of choice" (Ibid.).

The place was small, most probably least important of all, meaning almost ideal for a conference, where each party jealously cares for her prestige and importance, in comparison with other. But when everybody goes to the least influential, nobody is offended. However, practical and organizational issues appear then, for the host: "The strangers came from each of the twenty six other Trading worlds: delegates, wives, secretaries, newsmen, ships, and crews – and Radole's population nearly doubled and Radole's resources strained themselves to the limit. One ate at will, and drank at will, and slept not at all" (Ibid., 271).³¹

Negotiations precede, follow or are also exercised during the war. Sometimes the turn of events is unexpected and leads immediately to a negotiation process, what might have not been the case some time ago in the stream of events. Immediately after the battle, which appeared to be the last one of the last war during the Interregnum, towards the end of the Trilogy, Asimov uses such an approach. It was fought between the forces of the Foundation, which were attacked by the forces of Kalgan, commanded by Lord Stettin. Heavily defeated, he was advised by Lev Meirus, his First Minister: "Now, take my advice. You have the Foundation man, Homir Munn. Release him. Send him back to Terminus and he will carry your peace offers" (Ibid., 490). This done, it meant a huge change for the concerned Mr. Munn – from the prisoner of war he turned to be the envoy: "He had come alone, but he left escorted. He had come a simple man of private life; he left the unappointed but nevertheless, actual, ambassador of peace" (Ibid.). That suited him well: "The final two months of the Kalganian war did not lag for Homir. In his unusual office as Mediator Extraordinary, he found himself the center of interstellar affairs, a role he could not help but find pleasing" (Ibid.). The peace treaty was coined out: "The war was formally ended on an asteroid in Terminus' own stellar system; site of the Foundation's oldest naval base. Lev Meirus signed for Kalgan,

31 Tavčar (1999) offers in his novel a similar, fictional description of the atmosphere at the Congress of Ljubljana in 1821.

and Homir was an interested spectator” (Ibid., 490–491). Diplomats – mediators are by the rule present at the signing ceremony.

The art of negotiation knows a vast span of approaches. The hard one is a direct, blunt telling what is expected from the other party:

“What is your proposition, your eminence?”

The sub-prefect seemed quite ready to stop fencing in favor of more direct statements.

He said briskly: “It seems perfectly obvious that, since Terminus cannot defend itself, Anacreon must take over the job for its own sake. You understand we have no desire to interfere with internal administration – “ (Ibid., 41).

The opposite one is a highly passive, counting with the appropriate stream of developments and waiting for the right opportunity to arise (diplomatic delaying): “Then,” said Hardin, “you come to the conclusion that we must continue our intensive campaign of doing nothing” (Ibid., 54). This is exactly what suits diplomacy best: “Mostly, the novels consist of people sitting around and talking” (Wagner, 2011). And additionally: “There is action, but much of it is expressed through *dialogue* (italics – M. J.), with vast cosmic events occurring off-stage, between the lines, or tucked in as a neat flicker of resolution to the episode” (Darlington, 2011: 6).³² But not only suits, this *is* diplomacy, isn’t it? And it’s also more – seeking for a face saving formula: “So the Mule (...) must be defeated, but the defeat must be subtle – no dramatic space battles, no victory parade, in fact no obvious defeat at all” (Krugman, 2012: xiii).

PROTOCOL, REPRESENTATION AND SYMBOLISM

Asimov uses many elements of protocol in the Trilogy, be it formal addressing, etiquette, way of behavior and similar. We will quote and comment on some most typical. Protocol means procedure and details, it expresses politeness and friendship, respect and mutually equal treatment, based on reciprocity, but could also serve as a cover for pressure, blackmailing and showing muscles. But mostly and at least for the outside audience it generally means receptions and the

³² The author himself declares this (diplomatic background, we would say): “...virtually all the action takes place offstage...” (Asimov, 1988.b: xii).

related atmosphere: "Nothing but drinking, etiquette, and small talk now –" (Asimov, 1988.a: 231).

Two already mentioned envoys of higher authorities arrive to Terminus, one after another, each of them persuading the local authorities with the same message, namely that of their security guarantees: the first one from the neighbouring world, Anselm haut Rodric, the Sub-prefect of Puema and Envoy Extraordinary of his Highness of Anacreon, and the second one from the Galactic central authority, Lord Dorwin, Chancellor of the Empire. Their titles show the high authority, which they represent, while Asimov obviously knows the difference between the status of the two represented authorities. Both envoys are accepted with due respect, formalities and ritual. The first mentioned envoy "was met by Salvor Hardin at the spaceport with all the imposing ritual of a state occasion" (Ibid., 38). As much as the visit was annoying for the mayor, he covered up his feelings well: "It is certain that 'higher nobility' did not recognize irony when he heard it" (Ibid.). On the way to the City he "received the cheers (by the crowd outside – M. J.) with the complaisant indifference of a soldier and a nobleman" (Ibid.). During the discussion, the Chairman of the Board Dr. Pirenne addressed him properly: "Let me understand this, your eminence" (Ibid., p. 40). The third example shows that nobility cares for correct addressing, which reflects the high status: "You will stand in the presence of a Peer of the Realm" (Ibid., 215).

Asimov (Ibid.,195) also provides an insight view into the Galactic Empire inner circle hierarchy: "Cleon II was Lord of the Universe."³³ And not only this: "Cleon II commonly called 'The Great'. The last strong Emperor of the First Empire, he is important for the political and artistic renaissance that took place during his long reign."³⁴

Protocol is exact: "And Captain Pritcher in strict obedience to protocol bent one knee nearly to the ground and bowed his head until he heard the words of release" (Ibid., 247). However, this might not always be the case: "And so it happened, that when others bent their knee, he refused and added loudly that his ancestors in their time bowed no knee to any stinking mayor" (Ibid., 265). Such behavior does not go unnoticed: "You are then to appear, properly clothed, do you understand

³³ His Imperial Majesty, Cleon II. (Asimov, 1988.a: 217)

³⁴ A comparison with Frederic the Great is obvious. It tells us about the historical frame that Asimov uses and also about the art of diplomacy, employed as a reflection of that time. Comp. also Kennedy (1989) and Simms (2013).

- and with proper respect, too" (Ibid., 266). Further on, the illustration of a similar situation later in the text: "I am the regent and crown prince and am to be addressed as such" (Ibid., 316).

One could also claim that protocol means a heavy duty always to be respect, hence moments when this should not be the case, could be highly relaxed and appreciable: "It is a moment away from ceremony and courtiers. (...) Tonight there will be the official reception, but until then, we are free" (Ibid., 314). In the eyes of outsiders, who don't deal with state affairs - or maybe even don't care for them or may be this is just too far away from them - protocol might also be understood as a tool for impressing persons who seem to be important or whom one should avoid: "Noble Lords, I crave leave to tell you that my eldest son - a good worthy lad whom my poverty prevents from educating as his wisdom deserves - has informed me that the Elders will arrive soon. I trust your stay here has been a pleasant as my humble means - for I am poverty-stricken, though a hard-working, honest, and humble farmer, as anyone here will tell you - could afford" (Ibid., 377). This is the way how a farmer in an outside, periphery world of Rossem addresses strangers arriving there with a ship, obviously from the outer space. Of course the governor of that place knows the protocol: "His Excellency, Governor of Rossem, in the name of the Lords of Tazenda, is pleased to present his permission for an audience and request your appearance before him" (Ibid., 384).

Diplomatic immunity is part of protocol matters. Two consequent statements point this out; firstly: "I hope the Mule is capable of understanding that a Foundation ship is Foundation territory" (Ibid., 259), and secondly: "I'll inform you that this is a Foundation ship and consequently Foundation territory by international treaty" (Ibid., p. 260). We find additional illustration of the instrument of diplomatic immunity further on in the text, in a context of a huge search for a young girl Arcadia from the Foundation, at the Kalgan Airport (Ibid., 467):

"I want her papers." (...).

A short pause, and Pappa said with a weak smile, "I don't think I can do that."

"What do you mean you can't do that?" The policeman thrust out a hard palm. "Hand it over."

"Diplomatic immunity," said Pappa softly.

"What do you mean?"

"I said I was trading representative of my farm cooperative. I'm ac-

credited to the Kalganian government as an official foreign representative and my papers prove it. I showed them to you and now I don't want to be bothered any more."

Another example of diplomatic immunity, this time a breach of it by the officer in duty: "We picked up a prisoner," he said. "Yes?" "Little crazy fellow. Claims to be neutral – diplomatic immunity, no less" (Ibid., 485).

Diplomatic protocol is at its best when official events are going on – organization till the very detail, order of precedence, symbols and formalities. But still it is not easy to keep everything under control – there is always enough room to make a shortcut to the host or to the main guest. As Asimov (Ibid., 284–285) describes the situation when Hari Seldon is to appear for the fifth time in three centuries in the Time Vault, a diplomatic scandal occurs. Prior to the appearance the high representative of the Independent Trading Worlds unexpectedly approaches the mayor of Terminus, commander of the Foundation armed forces, and the diplomatic conflict bursts out:

"Excellence!" he muttered, and bowed.

Indbur frowned. "You have not been granted an audience."

"Excellence, I have requested one for a week." (...)

"We must unite, ambassador, militarily as well as politically."

Randu felt his throat muscles tighten. He omitted the courtesy of the opening title. (...)

Indbur frowned dangerously, "You are no longer welcome upon Terminus, ambassador. Your return will be requested this evening."

This event is one of the most illustrative and direct presence of diplomatic practice that Asimov uses in his Trilogy; it could also be claimed it is one of the most attractive ones for the literary effect of the story. Proclaiming a diplomat, even the ambassador – in this case even of one of the allied worlds – a *persona non grata* is always a tough diplomatic (and political) gesture with consequences for bilateral relations.³⁵ They depend on the level of the unwelcome diplomat of the sending state in the receiving state as well as on the current state of the affairs in bilateral relations and are always part of the reciprocity. It happens that the deed of the diplomat is sometimes just a pretext for proclaiming him/her *persona non grata* and that higher issues are at stake back

35 Article 9 of the Vienna Convention on the Diplomatic Relations.

stage, unless the diplomat is not violating the rules of behavior.³⁶

Representing the sending state in the receiving state is the beginning of maintaining diplomatic relations via residential diplomatic missions. It's embassies that perform this duty, and consulates that take care of protection of interests of the sending state and of its nationals, both individuals and bodies corporate (within the limits permitted by international law, in the receiving state).³⁷ Asimov (1988.a: 464) refers to this rule while describing documents of the above mentioned young girl Arcadia: "These are my papers," she said, diffidently. It was shiny, synthetic parchment which had been issued her by the Foundation's ambassador on the day of her arrival and which had been countersigned by the appropriate Kalganian official." Prior to this, upon her arrival to Kalgan, we learn that Foundation has the consulate on Kalgan: "Now look at that headline: 'Mobs Riot Before Foundation Consulate'" (Ibid., 452). Another clear example: "Ambassador Verisof is returning to Terminus" (Ibid., 69). With these examples we also via facti get to know that different worlds obviously were maintaining diplomatic and consular relations, although we do not learn anything more about it. But this would consequently also mean – what we learn through occasional remarks, too – that some worlds were exercising foreign policy activities; we list two examples, first: " (...) particularly as regards his foreign policy" (Ibid., 249), and second: "Your attack on the foreign policy of this government was a most capable one" (Ibid., 64).

Decorations could be understood as a part of protocol – diplomatic ceremonial provides also opportunities for decorating high representatives of ones own or even better, another state. Asimov (1988.a: 477–478) points out such a manner: "His admiral's uniform glistened imposingly upon his massive figure. The crimson sash of the Order of the Mule awarded him by the former First Citizen, whom six months later he had replaced somewhat forcefully, spanned his chest diagonally from right shoulder to waist. The Silver Star with Double Comets and Swords sparkled brilliantly upon his left shoulder." There are different purposes of awarding decorations, but their holders also impress people around themselves with them. This psychological effect

36 During the year 2004 there was a series of persona non grata diplomats across primarily Eastern Europe: the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovakia (all of them the new EU members) on one hand and the Russian Federation on the other side expelled more then ten diplomats all together. Some diplomats (primarily the Russian ones) were accused of interfering in domestic affairs of the receiving state and some were expelled as a countermeasure. Also Finland was among countries, which expelled Russian military attachés (Jazbec, 2007: 53).

37 Consular functions, Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, Article 5.

is important for various purposes, be it purely for prestige or also as a tool of gaining advantage in comparison with others.

Protocol always speaks for broader audience and public, since it is full of symbolism, either with direct or with hidden messaging. Public opinion expects symbolical messages from protocol and diplomats tend also to cover indirect messages in a frame of the protocol. As mentioned earlier, diplomats already speak with their simple presence: "It's another to fool around with an accredited envoy of the Foundation when the mere fact of his presence may mean the Foundation is growing suspicious" (Ibid., 128).

THE ROLE OF SMALL STATES

The theatre in which Asimov places his saga is the galaxy, across which the human race has expanded through millennia and inhabited twenty five million planets. The era he describes is the last period of the Galactic Empire, followed by its decline. But the time of the decline of empires has always also been the time of emergence of new states (among them frequently a number of small ones).³⁸ Readers follow the dying power of Trantor, its administrative center, the rise of Terminus, the habitation of the First Foundation, and many other planets that form political centers of various authorities, sometimes peripheral and sometimes central, sometimes small and sometimes big. The Galactic Empire is vast and during its decease different coalitions are formed to exercise power for their own benefit as well as against the Empire and also against the Foundation, according to ambitions of their leaders. Hence, those coalitions have limited period of time. Within this context we can borrow a useful comparable example from Thorhallsson (2000: 41): "Various emerging coalitions are very common in the EU, while long-term stable alignments are almost never seen. Occasional alliances usually concern one single issue or set of issues within a particular policy-area."³⁹

So, what could be lessons learned for contemporary small states the researched saga? To have a parallel with small states, one should firstly bear in mind how Asimov names political entities in his text: kingdoms, republics, planet states, dictatorships (Ibid., 365). They are planet sys-

38 Throughout the 20th Century there were four waves of the emergence of new and small states, always after the decline of the imperial ones: after the WWI and WWII as well during the decolonization period and after the end of the Cold War (comp. Jazbec, 2001: 46-47).

39 It is not our intention to compare the decease of the Asimov's Galactic Empire and the EU - we try to compare interests and circumstances for coalition building within big state systems.

tems, solar systems, also worlds, and when they are small, there is a comparison with small states in the contemporary international community. This would secondly mean that understanding small states' behavior must rest on a general level of comparison. Planets and their solar systems in such a huge galaxy could be easily detected when they are small: "It rules twenty-seven inhabited planets" (Asimov, *Ibid.*, 368). Some pursue aggressive politics with an aim to dominate parts of the galaxy, like Anacreon (*Ibid.*, 63) or Kalgan (*Ibid.*, 270), what usually turns out into coalitions, though generally not long lasting ones. They conclude peace treaties ("... and the new treaty signed with the trembling Leopold (...) this was followed in rapid order by similar treaties signed with each of the other three kingdoms ..." – *Ibid.*, 98) and conventions ("That's against the Convention". – *Ibid.*, 104). There is also one exemption: "And most of all, it is an obscure world that has adhered to strict neutrality in the local politics of that stellar region, and is not expansionist" (*Ibid.*, 368). Even more: "Didn't you notice that they never formed coalitions" (*Ibid.*, 372)? These are a few examples of intragalactic politics and of interstellar systems' relations. Worlds change their status, but generally they remain part of the Galactic Empire, where they benefit from its system: "I'm asking you in the name of the City, whose prosperity depends upon uninterrupted commerce with the galaxy, to call an emergency meeting – " (*Ibid.*, 36).⁴⁰ Some of them later break away and form regional alliances and some of them stick to the First Foundation during the period of the galactic dissolution. Thirdly, one should observe titles of the ruling politicians: mayor, governor, prefect, first minister, prime minister, chancellor, and various royal titles (king, lord, crown prince, regent). They also point out variations of statehood and governance.

Small states, comparatively understood, in Asimov's story expose a variety of forms of political behavior: they stick to the Galactic Empire and are loyal to it; they oppose it; they try to expand themselves; they break away; they make expansionist wars; but they also stick to themselves. Most commonly, they stick to the central authority (Galactic Empire, the First Foundation, and the Union of Worlds of the Mule) for security and welfare reasons, maintaining constant contacts across the galaxy (trade, tourism, leisure, science, job opportunities, farming etc.). They are tirelessly engaged in discussions and negotiation within a given system in handling home affairs to achieve better position for themselves. While performing this, it is important to know "[D]

40 The City is Terminus, the place (and the planet) of the First Foundation.

oes a small state have the administration capacity to defend its interests within the decision-making process of the EU (i.e. empire, solar system etc. – note M.J.)” (Thorhallsson, 2000: vii). In the Foundation Trilogy it is more up to the capability of individuals, leaders than of the administration (they are mayors and traders, private citizens and official envoys, farmers etc.).⁴¹ Small states (worlds) are also constantly engaged in discussions and negotiation with the outer authorities (what is diplomacy per se).

One could draw three kinds of policy advice from Asimov's text as far as small states are concerned. Firstly, small states are parts of bigger systems and/or coalitions; they benefit from them and contribute to them as well.⁴² Secondly, in times of crisis they follow local political circumstances, not necessarily opposing big powers, but (maybe also tactically) adapting to their pursuit. The role of an individual could be highly important.⁴³ Thirdly, neutrality is an exemption that proves the rule.⁴⁴ Additionally, small states should pursue their own interests also within their systems, integrations or organizations, since membership per se does not grant everything; it is only the starting point.

CONCLUSION

Asimov uses numerous and various references to diplomacy in his monumental work (written more than fifty years ago in a different historical context and situation, before the codification of diplomatic law took place). This is a known fact to each reader of the Trilogy.

The author – from one point of view – sticks to direct mentioning of diplomacy as an activity, in particular as protocol, negotiation and diplomatic reporting. This is primarily linked to diplomats – he is mentioning two classes of them: ambassadors and envoys. Both are career ones, while ad hoc envoys are primarily persons, who hold high political offices. It is also obvious that states/worlds pursue representative function, including residential diplomatic missions and consulates, conclude treaties and conventions, and organize protocol events (receptions, balls, cocktails).

41 Thorhallsson also points out the flexibility and capabilities of negotiators and permanent representatives as an advantage of small states in the EU (2000: 232).

42 As Braveboy-Wagner points out: »... small states are known to be coalition joiners and builders since such arrangements strengthen their voice and bargaining position vis-à-vis the larger countries” (2008: 140).

43 But not only on individuals: “... small states need to be particularly clever, efficient, and economical in devising appropriate strategies to meet their foreign policy goals” (Ibid., 2).

44 These general conclusions should be understood from the methodological and applicable points of view within the galactic frame: millions of worlds and centuries of time.

What we see – from another point of view – as even more important, typical, and with bigger narrative expression, the author creates circumstances, which demand the use of diplomacy, be it by professional diplomats or by persons who are only occasionally engaged in this profession (this reflects the scope of modern diplomacy). There are a few wars going on, with preceding, ongoing and succeeding negotiations. Planets and stellar systems form and change coalitions, hence they have to negotiate (through diplomatic means and by diplomatic representatives). They depend on trade, so they have to protect interests of individuals and bodies of corporate law – the Traders are almost a sacred trade mark of the First Foundation.

As far as small states are concerned, we can draw on a general level one basic conclusion: they should stick to coalitions (what could correspond to nowadays international organizations) for the sake of their security and wellbeing, while at the same time they should also continuously negotiate for their interests within the system.

Last but not least – could Asimov write the Foundation Trilogy without using elements and aspects of diplomacy? Basically yes, but with much less literary effect and persuasiveness. When main protagonists primarily sit and talk, while they solve inter/intra stellar and galactic affairs and problems, this *de facto* means diplomacy. In times of crisis – and dissolution of empires is a crisis indeed – one can not deal without diplomacy, if the narrative focuses on solving them and not on contemplating battles and their field development. This could be evident or not, but Asimov obviously chose the approach, which demands the use of diplomacy as a tool and as a way of storytelling. This mostly corresponds to the apparatus of modern diplomacy, combined with elements from the classical one. At the same time it broadens the selection of diplomatic approaches to that of the early diplomacy, what we mentioned in General Observations. All in all, it would also offer a suitable understanding for possible similar future researches.

Additionally, one could also say that the appearance of diplomatic elements and aspects in the Trilogy makes it more attractive to a reader. It contributes important elements of symbolism, secrecy and statehood. It is also the case that the presence of diplomacy educates the reader, although not on a comprehensive basis, for what there is no need to.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, M. S. (1993). *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy: 1450–1919*. London: Longman.
- Asimov, I. (1950). *I, Robot*. New York: Gnome.
- Asimov, I. (1988.a). *The Foundation Trilogy*. Norwalk: The Easton Press.
- Asimov, I. (1988.b). The Story behind the "Foundation". In: Asimov, Isaac. 1988. *The Foundation Trilogy*. Norwalk: The Easton Press. Pp. vii–xiii.
- Benko, V. (1997). *Zgodovina mednarodnih odnosov*. Ljubljana: Sophia.
- Benko, V. (1998). Mesto in funkcije diplomacije v razvoju mednarodne skupnosti. In: Jazbec, M. (Ed.). *Diplomacija in Slovenci*. Celovec: Založba Drava, pp. 39–58.
- Berridge, G., R., Keens-Soper, M., Otte, G. T. (2001). *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Berridge, G., R. 2001. Machiavelli. In: Berridge, G., R., Keens-Soper, M., Otte, G. T. (2001) *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger*. Houndmills: Palgrave, pp. 7–32.
- Berridge, G., R. (2005). *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Braveboy-Wagner, J. A. (2008). *Small States in Global Affairs: The Foreign Policies of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM)*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Darlington, A. (2011). *Isaac Asimov: The Foundation Trilogy*. Accessible at: <http://www.andrewdarlington.blogspot.com.tr/2011/02/isaac-asimov-foundation-trilogy.html> (13 February 2014)
- Feltham, R., G. (1994). *Diplomatic Handbook*. Longman: London.
- Gilli, G., A. (1974). *Kako se istražuje: vodič u društvenim istraživanjima*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Gunn, James. 1988. Introduction. In: Asimov, Isaac. 1988. *The Foundation Trilogy*. Norwalk: The Easton Press. pp. i–iv.
- Hampton, T. (2009). *Fictions of Embassy: Literature and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- James, E., Farah, M. (Eds.) (2003). *The Cambridge Companion to Science Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jazbec, M. (2001). *The Diplomacies of New Small States: The Case of Slovenia with some comparison from the Baltics*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Jazbec, M. (2006.a). *Ein Slovene in Belgrade: 1987–1991*. Klagenfurt: Mohorjeva.

- Jazbec, M. (2006.b). Diplomacy and security after the end of the cold war: the change of the paradigm. In: *Jahrbuch der Diplomatischen Akademie*. Vol. 41, pp. 163-177.
- Jazbec, M. (2007). *Vojaška in obrambna diplomacija*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
- Jazbec, M. (2009). *Osnove diplomacije*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
- Jazbec, M. (2013). Persuasion in Sociology of Diplomacy. In: Kurbalija, J. (Ed.). *Persuasion: the essence of diplomacy*. Geneva, Malta: Diplo and MEDAC. pp. 65–73.
- Kennedy, P. (1989). *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*. London; Fontana Press.
- Kovačević, Ž. (2004). *Međunarodno pregovaranje*. Beograd: Filip Višnjić.
- Krugman, P. (2012). Introduction. In: Asimov, I. *The Foundation Trilogy*. London: Folio Society. pp. ix–xvi. Accessible at: <https://webpace.princeton.edu/users/pkrugman/FDT%20intro.pdf> (15 February 2014), <http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/16/seldon-seen/> (15 February 2014)
- Kurbalija, J. (2013). Introduction. In: Kurbalija, J. (Ed.). *Persuasion: the essence of diplomacy*. Geneva, Malta: Diplo and MEDAC. pp. 1–6.
- Mann, G. (Ed.) (2001). *The Mammoth Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*. New York: Carnoll & Graf Publishers.
- Mullan, J. (2006). *How Novels Work*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nicolson, H. (1988). *Diplomacy*. Washington: Georgetown University.
- Osolnik, M. (1998). Diplomacija kot poklic. In: Jazbec, M. (Ed.). *Diplomacija in Slovenci*. Celovec: Založba Drava, pp. 122–139.
- Petrič, E. (2010). *Zunanja politika: osnove teorije in praksa*. Ljubljana, Mengeš: ZRC SAZU, CEP.
- Richelieu, A. du P., Cardinal de. (1990). *Testament politique*. Presented by Daniel Dessert. Paris: Complexe.
- Satow's Guide to Diplomatic Practice. 1994. London: Longman.
- Simms, B. (2013). *Europe: The Struggle for Supremacy, 1453 to the Present*. London: Allen Lane.
- Tavčar, I. (1999). *Izza kongresa*. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Thorhallsson, B. (2000). *The Role of Small States in the European Union*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Trdina, S. (1974). *Besedna umetnost, II. del: Literarna teorija*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- Uthmann, J., von. (1985). *Die Diplomaten: Affären und Staatsaffären von den Pharaonen bis zu den Ostverträgen*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

Väyrynen, R. (1997). Small States: Persisting Despite Doubts. In: Inbar, E., Sheffer, G. (Eds.). *The National Security of Small States in a Changing World*. Frank Cass. pp. 41–75.

Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

Vienna Convention on Consular Relations.

Wagner, M., 2011. *Isaac Asimov*. Accessible at: <http://mitchwagner.com/tag/isaac-asimov/> (12 February 2014)

Watson, A. (2009). *The Evolution of the International Society: A Comparative Historical Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Wolfe, G. (2007). Introduction: Speak Science Fiction Like an Earthling. In: Prucher, J.(Ed.). *Brave New Words: The Oxford Dictionary of Science Fiction*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. xix–xxi.