

Humanitarian Diplomacy: Modern Concepts and Approaches

O. Bogatyreva

Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin, Yekaterinburg, 620002 Russia
e-mail: olga.bogatyreva@urfu.ru

Received October 25, 2022; revised November 11, 2022; accepted November 28, 2022

Abstract—Modern trends in global development have significantly pushed the boundaries of modern diplomacy, an area that should be an effective tool for global dialogue. This study is focused on the humanitarian sector of diplomacy. The main discussions about approaches to the concept of humanitarian diplomacy that arose against the background of the idea of “humanism 2.0,” about the spread of the practice of humanitarian negotiations, and about the creation of humanitarian spaces are considered. The main approaches of foreign and Russian researchers to the concepts of humanitarian diplomacy are examined. Then, the tools of humanitarian diplomacy are analyzed and the similarities and differences with traditional official diplomacy tools are highlighted. It is established that nonstate actors play an important political role in humanitarian negotiations aimed at modern conflicts resolution. The role of the United Nations in creating a humanitarian partnership with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) is acknowledged. Attention is also paid to the humanitarian diplomacy of states, and the diversity of national models is noted. The main motives that encourage states to participate in humanitarian diplomacy are studied, and the main directions are highlighted. It is shown that today humanitarian practice is acquiring a polymodal, complex character. It includes humanitarian aid, social policy, and economic assistance in the context of the paradigm of sustainable development. The use of diplomatic tools and, above all, negotiations have a positive impact on the effectiveness of humanitarian activities in armed conflicts and crisis situations.

Keywords: diplomacy, humanitarian diplomacy, humanitarian aid, humanism, peacemaking, human rights

DOI: 10.1134/S101933162200047

Humanitarian diplomacy has thus far been neglected in academic research, which contrasts with the practical work of specialist practitioners in complex emergencies. Its nomination as an independent section of diplomatic practice is caused by the intensification of humanitarian activities in the context of armed interventions, international operations for civilian persons protection, natural disasters, and internal armed conflicts. In the 21st century Humanity continues to face high levels of suffering, and “the human cost exacted by conflict and violence is appalling.”¹ UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, in his report at the World Humanitarian Summit 2016, noted that 125 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance, and hundreds of thousands of civilians around the world are being persecuted, tortured, forcibly displaced, wounded, or killed, and humiliated.² By the end of the 2010s, more than 65 million

people had become internally displaced due to armed conflicts.³

The COVID-19 pandemic has also proved the importance of the humanitarian aspects of international relations. At the end of 2020, the Global Humanitarian Survey estimated that 235 million of the most vulnerable people in 56 countries were facing hunger, conflict, displacement, and effects of climate change.⁴ According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, at the same time, there were 82.4 million people around the world forcibly displaced around the world.⁵

In the conditions of multifunctionality and combination of modern peacekeeping formats, peacebuilding, humanitarian aid, and international development

¹ ICRC Strategy 2019–2022: *Institutional strategy*, Geneva, 2018, p. 3.

² United Nations, “One Humanity Shared Responsibility: Report of the United Nations Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit.” <http://sgreport.worldhumanitariansummit.org/>. Cited January 10, 2021.

³ Borgomeo, E., Delivering water services during protracted armed conflicts: How development agencies can overcome barriers to collaboration with humanitarian actors, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 2019, vol. 101, no. 912, p. 1068.

⁴ “The Global Humanitarian Overview 2021: Snapshot as of May 31, 2021.” https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/GHO_Monthly_Update_31MAY2021.pdf. Cited September 21, 2021.

⁵ UNHCR The UN Refugee Agency, “Global Trends Forced Displacement in 2020.” <https://www.unhcr.org/flagship-reports/globaltrends/>. Cited September 10, 2021.

overlap on a conceptual level.⁶ Practically, activities in these areas are often disconnected reducing the prospects for conflict resolution. Referring to the experience of NGOs, researchers offer to take a comprehensive view of conflicts by coordinating disparate actions within the framework of humanitarian diplomacy.⁷

Humanitarian diplomacy as an independent area of diplomatic activity crystallized after the end of the Cold War and focused on “maximizing support for operations and programs, and building the partnerships necessary if humanitarian objectives are to be achieved.”⁸ Currently, it has become one of the areas of diplomacy providing a humanitarian response to situations of armed conflicts, mass displacement, epidemics, or natural disasters. At the same time, the diversity of priorities, goals, and players involved in emergency situations causes differences in comprehension of humanitarian diplomacy, and the concept itself still raises skepticism due to the lack of term definition recognized by the international community.⁹ The meaning of humanitarian diplomacy diverges in different variants of conceptualization as broadly as the number of organizations using this term and the operations they conduct. Some authors perceive it as a limited and irregular activity; others see it as an alternative to official diplomacy¹⁰; the rest believes that humanitarian diplomacy is a “sculptor of possibilities” of humanism, formed to create space for a humanitarian impact.¹¹ The purpose of this article is to explore the outlines of the emerging concepts of humanitarian diplomacy in foreign and domestic

studies; to clarify its subject field, scope, and priorities; and to present an analysis of the tools and options for correlation with the traditional diplomacy.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT OF HUMANITARIAN DIPLOMACY

The term *humanitarian diplomacy* was used for the first time at the beginning of the 20th century by the American diplomat Oscar Straus, who distinguished it from the traditional repertoire of the activities of diplomatic departments.¹² After World War II and the spread of global humanism,¹³ the actual practice of humanitarian diplomacy began to take shape. C. Jönsson, having studied the evolution of diplomatic theories from the 1960s until the end of the Cold War, concluded that there was a new context in which diplomatic processes were developing.¹⁴ The civilian nature of the “new wars,” the participation of non-state armed groups in them, as well as the activation of non-state actors in negotiations for conflict resolution, have accelerated the conceptualization of humanitarian diplomacy.¹⁵ At the same time, researchers note that along with the classical principles of humanity, neutrality, fairness, and independence, “humanism 2.0” has emerged. As well as the “good offices,” expressed in the provision of humanitarian assistance and relief of suffering,¹⁶ it aims to achieve security and to combat terrorism and massive viola-

⁶ Zinovskii, Yu.G., Multilateral diplomacy and peacekeeping in the world of today, *Vestnik MGIMO University*, 2010, no. 6 (15), pp. 65–74; Korver, R., “Peacebuilding at the Intersection with Development and Humanitarian Aid,” *Beyond Intractability*, May 2020. <https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/peacebuildingdevelopment-humanitarian-aid>. Cited June 25, 2020.

⁷ Tabak, H., Broadening the nongovernmental humanitarian mission: The IHH and mediation, *Insight Turkey*, 2015, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 193–215.

⁸ Regnier, Ph., The emerging concept of humanitarian diplomacy: Identification of a community of practice and prospects for international recognition, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 2011, vol. 93, no. 884, p. 1211.

⁹ Kovba, D.M., The humanitarian dimension of diplomacy: The problem of categorization and analysis, *Herald of KRSU*, 2020, vol. 20, no. 11, pp. 170–173; Turunen, S., Humanitarian diplomatic practice, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2020, vol. 15, p. 466.

¹⁰ Ryfman, Ph., L’action humanitaire non gouvernementale: une diplomatie alternative?, *Politique étrangère*, 2010, no. 3, p. 576; Smith, H., Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Minnear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, p. 38.

¹¹ Turunen, S., Humanitarian diplomatic practice, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2020, vol. 15, p. 480.

¹² Straus, O.S., Wheeler, E.P., Theodore, P.I., Lange, C.L., Marbug, T., and Wheless, J., “Humanitarian diplomacy of the United States,” *Proceedings of the American Society of International Law at Its Annual Meetings (1907–1917)*, 1912, vol. 6, pp. 45–59.

¹³ Researchers associate “global humanism” with the creation of the UN and the adoption of the UN Charter, which set the task of promoting international peace and security; the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948; the Geneva Conventions of 1949; the Geneva Convention on the Status of Refugees, etc. The UN began to discuss and make decisions on issues of international peace and security, humanitarian assistance, international humanitarian law, international human rights law, etc. During the 1960s and 1970s, treaties aimed at protecting human rights were adopted, for example, the international pacts of 1966. The collapse of the colonial system and the consolidation of the rights of peoples in international documents should also be noted.

¹⁴ Jönsson, C., Diplomacy, bargaining, and negotiation, *Handbook of International Relations*, Carlsnaes, W., Risse T., and Simmons, B., Eds., London: SAGE Publications, 2002, pp. 212–234.

¹⁵ Kaldor, M., *New & Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Redwood City: Stanford University Press, 2012.

¹⁶ Gordon, S. and Donini, A., Romancing principles and human rights: Are humanitarian principles salvageable?, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 2015, vol. 97, no. 897–898, pp. 105–106.

tions of human rights.¹⁷ Commitment to “humanism 2.0” implies an active political stance that should not remain indifferent to human rights violations in conflict-affected countries. A new approach to humanism, the formation of a politicized concept of “humanitarian space,”¹⁸ “providing unhindered access to people in need”¹⁹ and spread of the practice of humanitarian negotiations²⁰ led to discussions about the popular approaches to the concept of humanitarian diplomacy.

A. Abenza²¹ and N. Kornago indicate that, since its formation, the diplomacy of states has been carried out based on the principle of protecting victims from extreme forms of suffering. It should be noted that representatives of traditional diplomacy during negotiations had to resolve humanitarian issues related to agreeing on the terms of truce; protection from wars, hunger, or disease; and “setting the limits for violence

between political communities.”²² The first humanitarian rules, enshrined in antiquity, were associated with the granting of immunity to those who had to retrieve the bodies of dead soldiers, the first forms of asylum, the exchange of prisoners, and basic forms of compassion. It was forbidden to use poisoned weapons or to kill old people, women, and children, guardians of temples, or prisoners. For example, the Indian epic Mahabharata and the Laws of Manu included provisions forbidding the killing of surrendered opponents who were no longer capable of fighting. The laws also forbade the use of certain means of warfare (poisoned or burning arrows) and thoroughly stated the protection of enemy property and prisoners of war.²³

Over the centuries, humanitarian attitudes have evolved against the backdrop of changing doctrinal ideas about the value of human life and the right to war as a political weapon. Created in 1863, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) began to play a leading role in the development of ideas about the protection and dignity of the affected population. These principles have become a common ideological basis for international humanitarian organizations working in the *dunantist* paradigm.²⁴ In the 20th century, suffering and misery caused by the new destructive technologies of war led to the signing of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and their Additional Protocols. The development of international humanitarian law (IHL) has become one of the achievements of diplomacy and has contributed to the formation of the humanism of nongovernmental organizations.

In the context of this historical experience, researchers ask whether humanitarian diplomacy can be considered as a fundamentally new field of activity, or we deal with the product of adaptation of traditional diplomacy to the challenges of globalization. S. Turunen points out the need to distinguish between reality and its comprehension, arguing that humanitarian diplomacy is a new term, but an “old practice.”²⁵

In the works devoted to humanitarian diplomacy, both the theory and practice of humanitarian diplomacy were noted. Turunen, Abenza, and Lauri wrote

¹⁷At the end of the twentieth century and beginning of the twenty-first, various approaches to understanding humanism were formed: from absolute neutrality, which was initially guided by the ICRC, to the rejection of neutrality. In modern conditions, humanitarian principles often depend on political, economic, and military goals. One of the reasons for this transformation of humanism is related to the fact that humanitarian assistance and protection are provided by various entities—international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, religious organizations, and private corporations. Some actors are forced to cooperate with governments to achieve humanitarian goals, abandoning the principle of neutrality. For example, delivering food to the Tamil population in Sri Lanka in the midst of civil conflict required the UN World Food Program to give up its “no military on the ground” principle in favor of a humanitarian imperative. Such cooperation with the government contributed to the objectives of the military and political agenda in Sri Lanka and thus violated the principle of neutrality. <https://www.wfp.org/countries/sri-lanka>.

¹⁸The term “humanitarian space” is based on international humanitarian law and is widely used by international humanitarian organizations, including UN OCHA, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and others. Humanitarian space refers to the geographical, territorial space in which there is physical access to people in need of assistance; it can also be an institutional space in which the safety of the population and its protection (creation of social, political and military conditions) are ensured. For example, on July 16, 2021, the UN Security Council hosted a briefing on “Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict: Preserving Humanitarian Space.” <https://www.icrc.org/en/document/humanitarian-space-must-be-protected-without-exception/>.

¹⁹Chandler, D., The Road to Military Humanitarianism: How the Human Rights NGOs Shaped a New Humanitarian Agenda, *Human Rights Quarterly*, 2001, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 681.

²⁰Mc Hugh, G. and Besler, M., *Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups: Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups: A Manual for Practitioners*, United Nations, January 2006. <https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/dms/Documents/HumanitarianNegotiationswArmedGroupsManual.pdf>. Cited August 25, 2021.

²¹Abenza, O.A., Conceptualización de la diplomacia humanitaria y su papel en las crisis humanitarias de Oriente Medio, The Institute of Studies on Conflicts and Humanitarian Action (IECAN), Documento 19/2016. <https://iecah.org/images/Doc-uOmar1.compressed.pdf>. Cited July 7, 2021.

²²Cornago, N., Repensar la diplomacia humanitaria, *Nuevos planteamientos en diplomacia: La diplomacia humanitaria* (New Approaches in Diplomacy: Humanitarian Diplomacy), Martí, A. and Sancho, L., Eds., Madrid: Marcial Pons., 2020, pp. 31–34.

²³Singh, N., Armed conflicts and humanitarian laws of ancient India, *Studies and Essays on International Humanitarian Law and Red Cross Principles*, Swinarski, C., Ed., The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1985, pp. 531–536.

²⁴De Lauri, A. and Turunen S., “The time of the humanitarian diplomat,” 2021. <https://www.cmi.no/publications/7838-the-time-of-the-humanitarian-diplomat>. Accessed July 25, 2021. A paradigm that puts human life at the center of international interactions and is named after the founder of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Henri Dunant.

²⁵Turunen, S., Humanitarian diplomatic practice, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2020, vol. 15, p. 460.

about the need to develop a theory in order to offer “an analytical framework for humanitarian diplomatic practice.”²⁶ N. Kornago, S. Turunen, H. Smith, and other researchers associate formation of the concept of humanitarian diplomacy in the late 20th and early 21st century, with a new form of internal conflicts, characterized by the escalation of hostilities and internationalization, as well as exposing the limitations of traditional diplomatic tools for solving humanitarian problems.²⁷ In the 2000s–2010s, “complex emergencies” of various origins occurred regularly,²⁸ which were accompanied by forced displacement or mass exodus of people, the collapse of economies and state structures, civil strife, epidemics, famine, and the inaccessibility of quality healthcare.²⁹ In such situations, humanitarian diplomacy can include “pressure on governments to encourage action in a particular crisis” and “encouraging international organizations to respond to crises in due time, with due respect for international law.”³⁰ The practice of negotiations between politicians and humanitarian organizations to ensure access, assistance, and protection of civilians during conflicts and emergencies led to the formation of the concept of humanitarian diplomacy, which, according to A. De Lauri, began to “circulate more consistently” in the early 2000s.³¹

Amid the variety of specific formulations in the literature, two fundamental approaches to the definition of humanitarian diplomacy stand out—restrictive and expanded. The first is based on the concept developed

by the International Federation of Red Cross Societies (IFRC), according to which humanitarian diplomacy is “persuading decision-makers and opinion leaders to act, at all times, in the interests of vulnerable people, and with full respect for our fundamental principles.”³² The purpose of humanitarian diplomacy is to prevent and relieve suffering caused by conflict and violence, to provide assistance to victims, and to spread the norms of IHL. H. Slim stressed that ICRC diplomacy should be seen as an incentive to respect IHL in armed conflicts.³³

However, humanitarian diplomacy is not limited to the activities of the IFRC and the ICRC. It is carried out by a wide range of NGOs, the efforts of which are aimed at removing people from suffering and addressing the urgent problems of victims of crises. The main task of organizations such as Médecins Sans Frontières, Oxfam International, and CARE International is to negotiate with international or national players, to act as a neutral intermediary, and to help ensure that “the voices of the victims of armed conflicts and strife are heard.”³⁴

Thus, according to the restrictive concept, humanitarian diplomacy is the activity of specialized organizations in order to obtain space from political and military authorities for negotiations and the conscientious performance of their functions, based on the principles of independence, neutrality, and fairness.³⁵

Attempts to conceptualize humanitarian diplomacy as the activity restricted only to specialized NGOs aimed at saving lives and relieving suffering have not found unanimous support in the literature. Studies based on the analysis of empirical material have examined the areas of application of diplomatic efforts in which states, representatives of UN agencies, international intergovernmental organizations, and civil society institutions are involved.

A broad categorical analysis of the concept of “humanitarian diplomacy” was carried out by H. Smith, E. J. Clements, E. Rousseau and A. Pende, S. Turunen,

²⁶Turunen, S., Humanitarian diplomatic practice, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2020, vol. 15, p. 459.

²⁷Cornago, N., Repensar la diplomacia humanitaria, *Nuevos planteamientos en diplomacia: La diplomacia humanitaria* (New Approaches in Diplomacy: Humanitarian Diplomacy), Marti, A. and Sancho, L., Eds., Madrid: Marcial Pons., 2020, pp. 29–42; Turunen, S., Humanitarian diplomatic practice, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2020, vol. 15, pp. 459–487; Smith, H., Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Minear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, pp. 36–62.

²⁸The concept of a “complex emergency” first emerged in Mozambique in the late 1980s when help was needed for displaced people. Carpi, E., Emergency, *Humanitarianism: Keywords*, A. De Lauri, Ed., Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2020, p. 57. Complex emergencies involving multiple actors “have an exceptional capacity to disrupt the cultural, civic, political, and economic integrity of established societies,” pointing to the need for an international response. Carpi, E., Emergency, *Humanitarianism: Keywords*, A. De Lauri, Ed., Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2020, p. 57.

²⁹Cornago, N., Repensar la diplomacia humanitaria, *Nuevos planteamientos en diplomacia: La diplomacia humanitaria* (New Approaches in Diplomacy: Humanitarian Diplomacy), Marti, A. and Sancho, L., Eds., Madrid: Marcial Pons., 2020, pp. 35–37.

³⁰Fiott, D., Humanitarian diplomacy, *The Encyclopedia of Diplomacy*, Martel, G., Ed., Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2018, pp. 1–10.

³¹DeLauri, A., Humanitarianism: An Overview, Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI), 2021. <https://www.cmi.no/publications/7782-humanitarianism-an-overview>. Cited July 30, 2021.

³²“Policy of humanitarian diplomacy,” Adopted by the Governing Council in Paris in May 2009 (IFRC, 2009). <https://www.ifrc.org/en/what-we-do/humanitarian-diplomacy/humanitarian-diplomacy-policy/>. Cited May 29, 2020.

³³Slim, H., Humanitarian diplomacy: The ICRC’s neutral and impartial advocacy in armed conflicts, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 2019, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 67–77.

³⁴Harroff-Tavel, M., The humanitarian diplomacy of the International Committee of the Red Cross, *Relations Internationales*, 2005, no. 121, Spring (January–March), p. 78.

³⁵Minear, L. and Smith, H., Introduction, *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Minear, L. and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, pp. 1–5; Smith, H., Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Minear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, pp. 36–38; Rousseau, E. and Pende, A., Humanitarian diploma, *Global Diplomacy: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*, Balzacq, T., Charillon, F., and Ramel, F., Eds., Paris: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, p. 254.

N. Cornago, and other researchers.³⁶ They included negotiation in the interests of the person; protection of children, women, and vulnerable groups; and participation of state and non-state organizations in humanitarian action in an increasingly politicized context in the sphere of humanitarian diplomacy, based on the imperative of humanity.³⁷ In accordance with the expanded approach organization, famous personalities, states and international institutions are engaged in humanitarian diplomacy whenever their goal is to preserve human dignity.³⁸ Humanitarian diplomacy cannot be reduced solely to humanitarian aid; it has a comprehensive mission³⁹ and involves intervention not only in armed conflicts, but also in situations in which people are vulnerable due to natural disasters, epidemics, or social crises.⁴⁰

An unusual classification was proposed by the author of one of the most authoritative studies, Hazel Smith, who tried to summarize various ideas about humanitarian diplomacy in terms of goals, functions, methods, and subjects involved in it.⁴¹ As an analytical tool, Smith provided three ideal types of such representations. The first type was characterized as an oxymoron due to the assertions that the concept contains an internal contradiction: humanitarian work and diplomacy are two separate and sometimes opposite activities. If the goal of a diplomat is to ensure the

national interests and security of the country he represents, then humanitarian workers give priority to human life and the formation of a humanitarian space.⁴²

The second type comes from the position of common sense, the comprehension that in modern conflicts humanitarian diplomacy has become a fact of life. Humanitarian organizations personnel are forced to negotiate with governments and non-governmental actors, using the art of persuasion and compromise to achieve their statutory goals. Finally, the third ideal type presents humanitarian diplomacy as a necessary evil, since the actors involved in the conflict zone cannot remain impartial, they have to subordinate the solution of humanitarian problems to political imperatives. H. Smith emphasized that these types do not contradict each other, and each contributes to the understanding of the whole concept. Thus, humanitarian diplomacy is defined as “the advancement of international interests by peaceful means.”⁴³

T.V. Zonova was one of the first among Russian researchers who began to use the concept of humanitarian diplomacy in a broad sense. She associated its emergence with the events of the 20th century, making an important conclusion that humanitarian diplomacy, which proclaimed the primacy of human rights, went beyond the traditional framework of the legal personality of the state, since diplomatic institutions undertook the responsibility to create international organizations capable of developing a common will aimed at control over compliance with the fundamental human rights.⁴⁴

A breakthrough in the study of humanitarian diplomacy in the Russian scientific discourse was the monograph by E.S. Gromoglasova. This study was based on the recognition that humanitarian diplomacy is a large-scale and complex component in the foreign policy of modern states and international organizations. The author tried to conceptualize humanitarian diplomacy through the prism of global challenges. She defined it as a nonviolent component of foreign policy aimed at minimizing challenges and ensuring the security and well-being of a person as a biological and

³⁶Smith, H., *Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Minnear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, pp. 36–38; Rousseau, E. and Pende, A., *Humanitarian diploma, Global Diplomacy: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*, Balzacq, T., Charillon, F., and Ramel, F., Eds., Paris: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, p. 254; Turunen, S., *Humanitarian diplomatic practice, The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2020, vol. 15, pp. 459–487; Cornago, N., *Repensar la diplomacia humanitaria, Nuevos planteamientos en diplomacia: La diplomacia humanitaria* (New Approaches in Diplomacy: Humanitarian Diplomacy), Marti, A. and Sancho, L., Eds., Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2020, pp. 29–42.

³⁷Smith, H., *Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Minnear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, pp. 36; Fiott, D., *Humanitarian diplomacy, The Encyclopedia of Diplomacy*, Martel, G., Ed., Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2018, pp. 1–10.

³⁸Rousseau, E. and Pende, A., *Humanitarian diploma, Global Diplomacy: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*, Balzacq, T., Charillon, F., and Ramel, F., Eds., Paris: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, p. 254.

³⁹Davutoğlu, A., *Turkey's humanitarian diplomacy: Objectives, challenges, and prospects, Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 2013, vol. 41, no. 6, p. 868.

⁴⁰Rousseau, E. and Pende, A., *Humanitarian diploma, Global Diplomacy: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*, Balzacq, T., Charillon, F., and Ramel, F., Eds., Paris: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, p. 254.

⁴¹Smith, H., *Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Minnear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, pp. 38–41.

⁴²Smith, H., *Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Minnear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, p. 39.

⁴³Smith, H., *Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Minnear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, p. 59.

⁴⁴Zonova, T.V., *Conflicts or Consensus: Diplomacy as a Means to Achieve Peace, Kul'tura tolerantnosti: opyt diplomatii dlya resheniya sovremennykh upravlencheskikh problem* (A Culture of Tolerance: Diplomatic Experience for Solving Contemporary Management Problems), Tiulin, I.G., Ed., Moscow: MGIMO University, 2004, p. 220.

social form of life.⁴⁵ Particular attention is paid to the problem of humanitarian interventions, as well as the connection of humanitarian diplomacy with the concept of the “Responsibility to protect” (R2P).⁴⁶

This concept reflects the ideas of coercive diplomacy, defined in the works of Alexander George and analyzed in the informative publication by T.V. Zonova, dedicated to the role of multilateral diplomacy in resolving the Libyan conflict.⁴⁷ Researchers of humanitarian diplomacy note that coercive diplomacy, that is, the use or threat of force, is an undesirable and “too blunt tool” for achieving humanitarian goals.⁴⁸

In a number of publications, humanitarian diplomacy is considered in close interaction with the diplomacy of human rights.⁴⁹ Researchers studying the emerging fields of “disaster diplomacy” and “human rights diplomacy” believe that humanitarian diplomacy and human rights diplomacy have much in common. R. Mullerson acknowledged that they are closely related and sometimes difficult to distinguish from each other. The key difference, in his opinion, is that humanitarian diplomacy focuses on emergencies, and not on changing laws and practices within human rights diplomacy.⁵⁰

Researchers note the increased importance of political considerations when making decisions on the provision of assistance, which increases the chance of its manipulation. Most notable is the risk that humanism might justify military action. D. Chandler, D. Makre, and D. Reiff, pointing to the military campaigns in the Balkans, Afghanistan and Iraq, argue that a rights-based approach sets a dangerous precedent by spreading the notion that humanism can

secure humanity by offering more ambitious forms of protection than before.⁵¹ After the end of the Cold War, the universal foundation of humanitarian and human rights work was undermined and humanism turned into an ambiguous concept capable of justifying military action.⁵² Using the rhetoric of the vulnerability of people who find themselves in conflict zones, humanitarian operations are often accompanied by military interventions, turning into humanitarian interventions involving active participation of not political and diplomatic, but professional military structures.⁵³ This trend indicates the failure of humanitarian diplomacy.⁵⁴

Particular attention should be paid to the correlations of the concepts *humanitarian diplomacy* and *humanitarian cooperation*. In the works of domestic researchers devoted to the human dimension of international relations, the term *international humanitarian cooperation* is used, as it is understood as interaction that helps to smooth out the sharpness of interstate contradictions not only in the sociocultural sphere, but also in politics, economics, and security.⁵⁵ Humanitarian cooperation is one of the ways of expressing goodwill and manifestation of “soft power,” gaining and expanding knowledge about the “Other,” as well as developing intercultural dialogue and building trust relations between people living in different civilizational spaces.⁵⁶

At the same time, in a number of publications, the concepts of humanitarian cooperation and humanitarian diplomacy are not separated, but are considered

⁴⁵Gromoglasova, E.S., *Humanitarian diplomatiya v sovremennykh mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh: opyt sistemnogo issledovaniya* (Humanitarian Diplomacy in Modern International Politics: A Systemic View), Moscow: IMEMO RAN, 2018, p. 6.

⁴⁶Gromoglasova, E.S., *Humanitarian diplomatiya v sovremennykh mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh: opyt sistemnogo issledovaniya* (Humanitarian Diplomacy in Modern International Politics: A Systemic View), Moscow: IMEMO RAN, 2018, pp. 54–72.

⁴⁷Zonova, T.V., Limits of coercive diplomacy in international conflicts: The case of Libya, *Mezhdunarodnye protsessy*, 2017, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 36.

⁴⁸Smith, H., Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Min-ear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, p. 51.

⁴⁹Chernykh, N.A., Humanitarian diplomacy as a tool of social conflict resolution, *Voprosy upravleniya*, 2016, no. 3 (40), pp. 133–138; Mullerson, R., *Human Rights Diplomacy*, London: Routledge, 1997; Barnett, M., Human rights, humanitarianism, and the practices of humanity, *International Theory*, 2018, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 314–349; Pease, K.K., Introduction to human rights and humanitarian diplomacy, *Human Rights and Humanitarian Diplomacy*, Pease, K., Ed., Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020, pp. 1–18.

⁵⁰Mullerson, R., *Human Rights Diplomacy*, London: Routledge, 1997, p. 2.

⁵¹Chandler, D., The Road to Military Humanitarianism: How the Human Rights NGOs Shaped a New Humanitarian Agenda, *Human Rights Quarterly*, 2001, vol. 23, no. 3, p. 681; Macrae, J., The death of humanitarianism? An anatomy of the attack, *Disasters*, 1998, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 309–317; Riff, D., *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002.

⁵²Gordon, S. and Donini, A., Romancing principles and human rights: Are humanitarian principles salvageable?, *International Review of The Red Cross*, 2015, vol. 97, no. 897–898, pp. 107–108.

⁵³Zonova, T.V., Conflicts or Consensus: Diplomacy as a Means to Achieve Peace, *Kul'tura tolerantnosti: opyt diplomatii dlya resheniya sovremennykh upravlencheskikh problem* (A Culture of Tolerance: Diplomatic Experience for Solving Contemporary Management Problems), Tiulin, I.G., Ed., Moscow: MGIMO University, 2004, p. 228.

⁵⁴Smith, H., Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Min-ear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, p. 51.

⁵⁵Lebedeva, M.M., Social and humanitarian issues in international studies: The Russian perspective, *MGIMO Review of International Relations*, 2018, no. 1 (58), pp. 114–130.

⁵⁶Velikaya, A., The Russian approach to public diplomacy and humanitarian cooperation, *Rising Powers Quarterly*, 2018, no. 3(3), pp. 39–61; Lebedeva, M.M., Social and humanitarian issues in international studies: The Russian perspective, *MGIMO Review of International Relations*, 2018, no. 1 (58), pp. 114–130.

as a kind of political communication based on the use of “soft power” tools. Using a broad approach to the definition of humanitarian diplomacy, researchers include cultural exchange, dissemination of national culture, language, tourism development (cultural diplomacy); protection of human rights, freedoms, and dignity; participation in nonviolent resolution of political and social conflicts, and peacekeeping activities (diplomatic tools, including public diplomacy).⁵⁷

Such a broad interpretation, covering various activities and instruments, blurs the substantive core of humanitarian diplomacy. Organizations providing access to as well as assistance and protection for them affected populations resort to information gathering and analysis, negotiations, and other means interacting with not always equal partners and usually not in peaceful conditions, but in conflict and post-conflict situations. They have to deal not only with official state bodies, but also with their irreconcilable opponents, with representatives of armed groups. It is difficult to call cooperation the negotiations, for example, between the ICRC and non-state armed groups (NAGs), many of which are classified by governments as terrorist, and any contacts with which are excluded due to legislation criminalizing interaction with them.⁵⁸

D.M. Kovba explains the mosaic and vagueness of ideas about the humanitarian dimension of diplomacy by a significant broadness of the concepts of humanitarian, humanitarian activity, and humanitarian cooperation. She pointed out the subtle difference between the emphasis on help and the reduction of suffering in English and the interaction in the field of culture and art in Russian, as well as the designation of the sciences of culture, history, and society.⁵⁹ A. Pentegova and D. Kovba also drew attention to the fact that in domestic studies the term “international humanitarian cooperation” traditionally implies international relations in the fields of culture, science, education, tourism, and sports using the tools of people’s and public diplomacy.⁶⁰ Western scientific discourse is

characterized by an understanding of humanitarian cooperation as an urgent reaction of efforts to conflicts and disasters, as well as humanitarian assistance to the population in armed conflict and post-conflict situations.⁶¹

Returning to the expanded concept of humanitarian diplomacy, we note that, in recent years, the “classical dunantist paradigm” has been developing in parallel with the “resilience paradigm.”⁶² Both dictate new ways of looking at the nature of crises, the humanitarian system, and the scope of the response in areas at risk. Despite asserting the central role of humanity in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development,⁶³ the reality for millions of people in conflict, natural disasters, or situations of chronic poverty and deprivation is that they have to struggle every day for life and dignity, security, food, shelter, education, and health. The protracted and intractable nature of modern wars and the relocation of battlefields to the urban environment have led to the death of a large number of civilians, the spread of disease, and the destruction of vital infrastructure, which negatively affects the solution of global complex challenges for achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In addition, the number of parties in conflicts has increased dramatically and their various interests require diplomatic efforts and the parallel participation in negotiations of numerous actors: states, international organizations, NGOs, and individual leaders with political or economic influence.

The World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul in 2016, the culmination of a three-year process of diplomatic work, marked a turning point in the global humanitarian agenda by proclaiming the need to link humanitarian action with development, peacebuilding, and crisis resolution while respecting the most important principles: prevention and relieving suffering, protection of life and health, and ensuring respect for the human.⁶⁴ The UN Secretary General’s report emphasized the need to reorient tools and mechanisms, including diplomatic ones, in order to work simultaneously on crisis prevention and crisis. This will require a significant increase in the capacity,

⁵⁷Rusakova, O.F. and Rusakov, V.M., Soft power as the instrument of political communications and humanitarian diplomacy, *Diskurs-Pi*, 2017, no. 1 (26), p. 66.

⁵⁸Modirzadeh, N.K., Lewis, D.A., and Bruderlein, C., Humanitarian engagement under counterterrorism: A conflict of norms and the emerging policy landscape, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 2011, vol. 93, no. 883; Regnier, Ph., The emerging concept of humanitarian diplomacy: Identification of a community of practice and prospects for international recognition, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 2011, vol. 93, no. 884, pp. 83–84.

⁵⁹Kovba, D.M., The humanitarian dimension of diplomacy: The problem of categorization and analysis, *Herald of KRSU*, 2020, vol. 20, no. 11, p. 170.

⁶⁰Pentegova, A.V., The concept of humanitarian cooperation in the modern system of international relations, *Vestnik Zabaykalskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 2019, no. 4, pp. 54–60; Kovba, D.M., The humanitarian dimension of diplomacy: The problem of categorization and analysis, *Herald of KRSU*, 2020, vol. 20, no. 11, p. 170.

⁶¹Pentegova, A.V., The concept of humanitarian cooperation in the modern system of international relations, *Vestnik Zabaykalskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 2019, no. 4, p. 55.

⁶²Hillhorst, D., Classical humanitarianism and resilience humanitarianism: Making sense of two brands of humanitarian action, *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, 2018, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–12.

⁶³United Nations, “Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development,” UN document A/RES/70/1 of October 21, 2015. <https://undocs.org/ru/A/RES/70/1>. Cited January 20, 2021.

⁶⁴United Nations, “As World Humanitarian Summit Concludes, Leaders Pledge to Improve Aid Delivery, Move Forward with Agenda for Humanity,” World Humanitarian Summit, Round Tables, Special Sessions, and Closing, IHA/1401, May 24, 2016. <https://www.un.org/press/en/2016/iha1401.doc.htm>. Cited January 30, 2021.

skills, and number of staff of ministries of foreign affairs dealing with conflict prevention and crisis management, and the use of global and regional forums for the exchange of information and constant monitoring of events and contact groups, as well as tools of public, religious, and preventive diplomacy. Given that most conflicts are intrastate in nature, it is important that impartial humanitarian actors engage in dialogue with states, as well as NAGs, in order to strengthen their acceptance, understanding, and implementation of obligations under IHL and international human rights law (IHRL).⁶⁵

World Summit participants representing 180 UN Member States, 700 NGOs, as well as civil society, the private sector, and academia, formulated more than 3500 commitments aimed at reducing human suffering and bridging the gap between humanitarian assistance and development. The main provisions of the Agenda for Humanity adopted at this forum included the responsibility to change people's lives, from providing assistance to ending poverty, "leaving no one behind," in particular through the reduction of forced population displacement, support for refugees and migrants, and closing gaps in education, as well as fighting to end sexual and gender-based violence. Meeting the challenge requires bridging the gap between humanitarian assistance and development.⁶⁶

The new architecture model of assistance sparked discussion among both researchers and practitioners about the concept of a "triple link" covering peace-building, humanitarian assistance, and the achievement of the SDGs.⁶⁷ The "triple link" is expressed in the joint work of the actors of humanitarian activity, development, and peace promotion, in dialogue and exchange of experience and analysis of situations, including using diplomatic tools. Humanitarian actors have to link emergency humanitarian assistance with the restoration and development of medical care, sanitation, water supply, and the search for missing persons. For example, the ICRC's desire not only to protect the victims, but also to ensure the sustainability of

its results, led to the inclusion in the organization's new strategy of the goal aimed at ensuring a sustainable humanitarian impact using the tools of humanitarian diplomacy.⁶⁸

Since the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in 2015, the activities of the ICRC have been linked not only to caring for the wounded and sick on the battlefield and visiting persons detained because of the armed conflicts and other situations of violence, but also to maintaining the system of health care and other humanitarian services that help keep people alive. Moreover, the ICRC's Health Strategy 2020–2023 so aims to meet the health needs of protracted conflicts, climate disasters, environmental degradation, and epidemics.⁶⁹ ICRC President Peter Maurer noted in 2012 that he could not imagine the future of the organization "without a clear plan of action and the most advanced knowledge in the field of medical care and the provision of medical services in times of crisis."⁷⁰ Gaps in social protection and weak health structures in conflict-affected areas have come to the fore amid the devastating effects of the current COVID-19 pandemic. Combining the paradigms of "humanity" and "sustainability" in its activities, the ICRC, as a subject of humanitarian diplomacy, is forced to form new flexible partnership mechanisms, interacting with states, NGOs, UN agencies, investors, and international financial institutions, conducting negotiations with special attention to increasing community sustainability. In particular, the partnership with the World Bank has enabled the ICRC to develop the new financial instruments needed to meet the goal of sustainable humanitarian influence.⁷¹

Thus, an analysis of the outlines of the emerging concept of humanitarian diplomacy shows that in the modern conditions there is a universalization of its comprehension in the context of the expanded approach. The framework of the concept is the fundamental principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, and independence. Along with them, the principles of *respect for human rights and freedoms, the duty to protect and assist, and the provision of humanitarian long-term assistance for sustainable development*, which are considered universal. At the same time, the interpretation and implementation of the principle of the *human rights* protection cannot depend on national

⁶⁵United humanity: Common responsibility, Report of the UN Secretary General in connection with the World Humanitarian Summit. UN Document A/70/709 dated February 2, 2016. <https://undocs.org/en/A/70/709>. Cited December 25, 2020.

⁶⁶Post-World Humanitarian Summit: Agenda for Humanity, International Council of Voluntary Agencies. <https://www.icva-network.org/world-humanitarian-summit-0>. Accessed January 30, 2021; <https://agendaforhumanity.org/resources.1.html>. Cited January 30, 2021.

⁶⁷Hall, S., Towards the Triple Nexus: Toolkit on Afghanistan's NPPs, SDGs, and Triple Nexus. DACAR, August 2020. https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKewi-m5njgaz1AhWTyYsKHa4XAT0QF-noECAIQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.samuelhall.org%2Fs%2FSDG-DACAAR-Final-Report-V2.pdf&usg=AOvVaw3Uyk-wdcDvm47GOaQhYLr_a. Cited January 12, 2022; Guinote, F.S., Q&A: The ICRC and the "humanitarian–development–peace nexus" discussion, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 2019, vol. 101, no. 912, pp. 1051–1066.

⁶⁸ICRC Strategy 2019–2022: *Institutional Strategy*, Geneva: International Committee of the Red Cross, 2018.

⁶⁹Health Strategy 2020–2023, Geneva: International Committee of the Red Cross, January 2021.

⁷⁰Interview with ICRC President Peter Maurer, *International Journal of the Red Cross*, 2012, no. 888. Humanitarian challenges of our time: Selected articles. p. 10. https://international-review.icrc.org/sites/default/files/02_maurer_ircr_874-889_selection_2013_eng-2.pdf. Cited February 16, 2021.

⁷¹Guinote, F.S., Q&A: The ICRC and the "humanitarian–development–peace nexus" discussion, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 2019, vol. 101, no. 912, p. 1057.

selfishness and must not provoke a clash of political interests of states.

In order to offset the damage that can be caused by the politicization of humanitarian action, fundamental humanitarian principles must be reaffirmed and respected. It should also be noted that development assistance is aimed not only at the implementation of long-term projects to achieve the SDGs and meet humanitarian needs, but also at reducing the risks of vulnerability.

SCOPE, PRIORITIES, AND INSTRUMENTS OF HUMANITARIAN DIPLOMACY

The tools of humanitarian diplomacy are of considerable interest to researchers. In the search for effective means, they are trying to find out what traditional features should be retained and what new tools should be used. G. Nikolson showed that diplomacy, which is peaceful in nature, is not the development of a policy, but negotiations on its implementation, aimed at persuading and finding a compromise.⁷² At the same time, the diplomat performs three main functions: representation, communication (information and observation) and negotiations. Researchers, studying the nature of humanitarian diplomacy, note that its subjects also use the tools of traditional diplomacy: they collect information, carry out propaganda work in the interests of achieving humanitarian goals and protecting human rights, enter into dialogue and convince decision makers, and interact with the media to ensure public awareness of the situations in which they are involved. Experts emphasize that the ability to negotiate is the most important skill in humanitarian work. In addition, traditional methods are complemented by modern methods with the use of information and communication technologies and social networks, as well as public diplomacy tools.⁷³ For example, A. Abenza highlighted the political and humanitarian (establishing contacts, negotiations, and finding compromises) and information and propaganda (upholding IHL and humanitarian principles) areas of humanitarian diplomacy.⁷⁴ Its legal foundation should also be noted. If traditional diplomacy is based on diplomatic and consular law, then humanitarian diplomacy is also based on the norms of IHL, international refugee law, and IHRL, forming a kind of “humanitarian internationale.”

⁷²Nikolson, G., *Diplomatiya* (Diplomacy), Moscow: OGIZ, 1941, p. 20.

⁷³Leira, H.A., Conceptual History of Diplomacy, *The SAGE Handbook of Diplomacy*, Constantinou C., Kerr P., and Sharp, P., Eds., London: SAGE Publications, 2016, p. 35.

⁷⁴Abenza, O.A., “Conceptualización de la diplomacia humanitaria y su papel en las crisis humanitarias de Oriente Medio.” <https://iecah.org/images/DocuOmar1.compressed.pdf>. Cited July 30, 2021.

M. Clarke, through field research and a series of interviews with humanitarian workers involved, including in the aftermath of the 2010 Haiti earthquake, found that dialogue and negotiation were a core part of their work, which led to the inclusion of these functions in their job descriptions and responsibilities. He pointed to the need to develop a common approach to the practical implementation of humanitarian diplomacy, which should also apply to states. All humanitarian organizations should be involved in diplomacy at the national and global levels, without outsourcing it to one specific entity, even one as reputable as the ICRC.⁷⁵

The work by E.J. Clements, based on study of the Yemeni Houthi movement and the independence army in Myanmar, allowed him to draw a conclusion about the important political role of humanitarian organization personnel operating in contemporary conflicts and about their influence on the rhetoric and actions of states, non-state actors, and multilateral institutions. In difficult conditions, such as in Yemen, humanitarian personnel are the only representatives of the international community that remain after the withdrawal of the diplomatic corps and the displacement of journalists. In this regard, humanitarian actors play an important role in identifying problems, forming ideas about the conflict and its consequences, and suggesting political ways to overcome them.⁷⁶ Researchers have repeatedly paid attention to the speeches of NGO representatives in the UN Security Council.⁷⁷ As noted by J. Wiseman, “NGOs invaded the Security Council.”⁷⁸ Using Article 30 of the UN Charter, the UN Security Council established the Arria-Formula Meetings,⁷⁹ in which consultations are held with the participation of members of the public. Since 1992, the UN Security Council has regularly held such meetings with the participation of diplomats, officials of international organizations, NGOs,

⁷⁵Clark, M.D., *Humanitarian Multi-track Diplomacy: Conceptualizing the Definitive, Particular, and Critical Role of Diplomatic Function in Humanitarian Action*, Groningen: University of Groningen, 2018.

⁷⁶Clements, A.J., *The Frontlines of Diplomacy: Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups*. A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the Australian National University, 2018.

⁷⁷Lebedeva, M.M. and Ustinova, M.I., The humanitarian and social agenda of the UN Security Council, *International Organizations Research Journal*, 2020, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 140.

⁷⁸Wiseman, G., Diplomatic practices at the United Nations, *Cooperation and Conflict*, 2015, vol. 50, no. 3, p. 333.

⁷⁹The institutionalization of informal meetings and consultations between members of the UN Security Council and representatives of the public is connected with the initiative of the Ambassador of Venezuela, Diego Arria, who in 1992 held the post of chairman of the Security Council. Since 1992, the UN Security Council has held 311 meetings according to the Arria formula. <https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/un-security-council-working-methods/arria-formulameetings.php>. Cited August 1, 2020.

and academia, discussing issues such as human rights in conflicts, protection of women and children, accountability for sexual violence, the situation of people with disabilities in armed conflicts, minority rights, ecology, and counter-terrorism. For example, on May 7, 2021, the UNSC hosted an Arria formula meeting on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on violations of children's rights in situations of armed conflict. The discussion was attended by representatives of the UN bodies involved in the protection of children, the implementation of the UN Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, staff of the Office of Emergency Programs of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the regional director of the non-governmental organization Save the Children.⁸⁰ At the meeting on August 11, 2021, along with members of the UNSC, issues of humanitarian action and overcoming difficulties in situations of armed conflict and counter-terrorism operations were discussed by representatives of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and the UN Office of Counter-Terrorism, the African Union Commissioner for Political Affairs, Peace, and Security, as well as the director of the ICRC's Department of International Law and Politics, which is in charge of humanitarian diplomacy.⁸¹

As noted above, humanitarian diplomacy is closely linked to UN priority peacekeeping activities. The attention of the UN Security Council is focused on emergency situations and the provision of continuous access to humanitarian assistance and protection at the national and local levels.⁸² For example, UNSCR 2533 provided for humanitarian access across the lines of confrontation and the external borders of Syria.⁸³ Further, these goals are implemented in the diplomatic practice on the ground. Negotiations on access, ceasefires, the construction of humanitarian corridors, and respect for international humanitarian law are taking place at all levels, from contacts with field commanders on the front lines to the humanitarian

impact at the level of global governance.⁸⁴ At the same time, E.J. Clements showed that, at the lowest (local) level, the "negotiating table" can sometimes consist of barricades at a checkpoint.⁸⁵

Researchers pay attention to the challenges associated with the conditions in which humanitarian actors have to work. First of all, this is the problem of access to provide assistance during internal armed conflicts, the number of which has increased significantly at the beginning of the 21st century. As of the end of 2021, there were 57 ongoing armed conflicts worldwide between two or more armed governmental and non-governmental groups.⁸⁶ The bloodiest wars of the twenty-first century occurred in Syria, Sudan, Iraq, Afghanistan, the eastern part of Ukraine, and Yemen. The conflicts in Sierra Leone, Libya, Afghanistan, South Sudan, and Syria involve different types of actors, including illegal armed groups. Their increase has become a central feature of the changing political landscape of the 2010s. In some cases, analysts have observed hundreds if not thousands of groups involved in armed violence.⁸⁷ Aggressive non-state groups use strategies that grossly violate the principles of the UN and IHL and commit robberies and violence against humanitarian personnel.⁸⁸ Often, governments involved in conflicts do not comply with international law. All this raises ethical and legal issues, making humanitarian work difficult and unsafe.

As noted above, states can create barriers to access to territories where NAGs operate. It is important for humanitarian actors that states do not consider negotiations and other contacts with NAGs illegal. Humanitarian organizations advocate the right to engage in dialogue with non-state armed groups in order to obtain the consent of parties to the conflict to provide assistance safely and protect civilians.⁸⁹

⁸⁰Arria-Formula Meetings. https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/working_methods_arria_formula_meetings.pdf. Cited July 31, 2020.

⁸¹Overcoming Challenges in Situations of Armed Conflict and Counter-Terrorism Operations, Security Council Arria Formula Meeting, August 11, 2021. Security Council United Nations. <https://media.un.org/en/asset/k1p/k1pikud42f>. Cited August 25, 2021.

⁸²Turunen, S., Protection of Civilians and Humanitarian Diplomacy: How Operational and Policy Ends Influence One Another and How to Navigate this Relationship through Humanitarian Diplomacy, CMI. CHR. Michelsen Insight. February 2021. <https://www.cmi.no/publications/7457-protection-of-civilians-norway-in-the-security-council.pdf>. Cited May 23, 2021.

⁸³Resolution 2533 (2020), adopted by the Security Council on July 11, 2020. S/Res 2533 (2020), UN Security Council Resolutions, 2020. [https://undocs.org/ru/S/RES/2533\(2020\)](https://undocs.org/ru/S/RES/2533(2020)). Cited February 20, 2021.

⁸⁴De Lauri, A. and Turunen, S., The time of the humanitarian diplomat, Norwegian Center for Humanitarian Studies. <https://www.humanitarianstudies.no/2021/07/06/the-time-of-the-humanitarian-diplomat/>. Cited July 6, 2021.

⁸⁵Clements A.J., Getting armed groups to the negotiating table, CMI Brief no. 2020:10. <https://www.cmi.no/publications/7425-getting-armed-groups-to-the-negotiating-table>. Cited October 10, 2020.

⁸⁶The Armed Conflict Location & Event Data, Disaggregated Data Collection, Analysis & Crisis Mapping Platform. <https://acleddata.com/#/dashboard>. Cited December 30, 2021. According to the UN, in modern conflicts, up to 90% of the victims are civilians, mostly women and children. (*Peace and Security*, United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/globalissues/peace-and-security>. Cited December 30, 2021.)

⁸⁷Colombo, S., Calvento, L., Di Megilo, M., Nicolao, J., Sarthou, N., Di Lorenzo, D., and Sol Herrero, M., *Asistencia humanitaria y política exterior Argentina: a una década del nuevo paradigma en la región Latinoamericana y Caribeña 2003–2013*, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, 2014, p. 68.

⁸⁸Bastos, 2015.

⁸⁹Clements, A.J., Getting armed groups to the negotiating table, CMI Brief no. 2020:10. <https://www.cmi.no/publications/7425-getting-armed-groups-to-the-negotiating-table>. Cited October 10, 2020.

According to ICRC vice-president Christine Berli, her organization's contacts with all parties to the conflict, with government officials and with various NAGs, allow personnel to be in the conflict zone. For example, in 2019, this organization interacted with more than 400 armed groups around the world. In Yemen, where a large number of armed groups are fighting, only the ICRC and Doctors without Borders can work, due to a good network of contacts.⁹⁰

To overcome negotiation problems, humanitarian NGO staff often use a third party to put pressure on armed groups. In particular, the UN Security Council imposed targeted sanctions against leaders of armed groups who are accused of obstructing humanitarian access in Yemen, South Sudan, and Mali.⁹¹ The incentive for the NAG to participate in the negotiations, as Clements notes, is connected with their need for legitimacy. For example, the Taliban⁹² and the Lebanese Hezbollah and Al-Shebaab⁹³ used the COVID-19 pandemic to gain greater political legitimacy. Supporting public health and demonstrating the ability to serve the interests of the population, they provided access and security guarantees to humanitarian agencies.⁹⁴ Clark called such groups "yesterday's terrorists" and public health providers.⁹⁵

There is a current trend towards recognizing negotiations with NAGs as a legitimate practice that is an integral part of humanitarian action. In this regard, a group was formed at the UN to strengthen cooperation on security issues for the organization's personnel and NGOs. The latter were assigned an important role in reaching agreements on humanitarian corridors, and in "bringing the opposing sides to the negotiating table."⁹⁶ Researchers recognize the socializing power

of diplomacy, which can transform the behavior of conflict participants to be more civilized and humane,⁹⁷ and interaction with NAGs can transform the conflict into a nonviolent form.⁹⁸ In the foreign literature, it is widely believed that the involvement of the enemy in negotiations can stop the use of force. The Guide to Humanitarian Negotiations, prepared by the Center for Humanitarian Dialogue, contains a description of such interaction: "international law obliges governments to provide people living in territory under their control access to assistance and protection." When they fail to fulfill their obligations, "humanitarian action aims to prevent, limit, and stop violations."⁹⁹

Analyzing the directions of humanitarian diplomacy, most researchers note that it is not limited to negotiations. For example, non-governmental players may be involved in the preparation of international treaties.¹⁰⁰ This practice is illustrated by the adoption in 1984 Latin America of the Cartagena Declaration on Refugees and documents that develop its ideas: the San José Declaration (1999), the Mexico Declaration (2004), and the Brazilia Declaration (2014). They were developed with the active participation of scientific experts, NGOs, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, being an example of a departure from the classical mechanism of intergovernmental negotiations and the formation of a new type of hybrid diplomacy, involving coordinated multilateral cooperation in the humanitarian sphere.¹⁰¹ According to D. Hilhorst, the 2018 Global Compact on Refugees, focusing on promoting the resilience of refugees and finding agreed solutions to their problems through the efforts of states, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and NGOs also indicated a new type of diplomacy and the transition from classical humanism to resilience humanism.¹⁰²

Everyday humanitarian diplomacy can be associated, for example, with the practice of escorting people across the border. This form of action is aimed at

⁹⁰International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Dialogue with all parties to the conflict: Crime or achievement? <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vzu0JWr6UC4>. Cited May 10, 2021.

⁹¹United Nations Security Council, Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 2140, 2014. <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/en/sanctions/2140>. Accessed May 21, 2021; United Nations Security Council, Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 2206 on South Sudan, 2015. <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/ru/sanctions/2206>. Cited May 21, 2021; United Nations Security Council, Resolution 2374 (2017) adopted by the Security Council, S/RES/2374, 2017. <https://undocs.org/ru/S/RES/2374%282017%29>. Cited May 21, 2021.

⁹²A terrorist organization banned in Russia.

⁹³A terrorist organization banned in Russia.

⁹⁴Clements, A.J., Getting armed groups to the negotiating table, *CMJ Brief no. 2020:10*. <https://www.cmi.no/publications/7425-getting-armed-groups-to-the-negotiating-table>. Cited October 10, 2020.

⁹⁵Clarke, C.P., Yesterday's terrorists are today's public health providers, *Foreign Policy*, April 8, 2020. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/04/08/terrorists-nonstate-ungoverned-health-providerscoronavirus-pandemic/>. Cited December 10, 2021.

⁹⁶United Nations Security Council. S/2001/331. Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on the protection of civilians in armed conflict. file:///C:/Users/1/Downloads/Disarm%20S2001331.pdf. Cited July 10, 2020.

⁹⁷Sharp, P., Mullah Zaeef and Taliban diplomacy: An English school approach, *Review of International Studies*, 2003, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 481–498.

⁹⁸Toros, H., Legitimacy and complexity in terrorist conflicts, *Security Dialogue*, 2008, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 413–414.

⁹⁹Mancini-Griffoli, D. and Picot, A., *Humanitarian negotiation: A Handbook for Securing Access, Assistance, and Protection for Civilians in Armed Conflict*, Geneva: Center for Humanitarian Dialogue, 2004, p. 11.

¹⁰⁰Ryfman, Ph., L'action humanitaire non gouvernementale: une diplomatie alternative?, *Politique étrangère*, 2010, no. 3, p. 573.

¹⁰¹Barrichello, S.E., Refugee protection and responsibility sharing in Latin America: solidarity programmes and the Mexico Plan of Action, *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 2015, vol. 20, issue 2, pp. 191–207.

¹⁰²Hillhorst, D., Classical humanitarianism and resilience humanitarianism: Making sense of two brands of humanitarian action, *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, 2018, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 6.

supporting migrants and refugees along the borders in conflict zones and in the post-war environment. C. Muguruza studied the activities of the international non-governmental Catholic refugee organizations *Jesuit Migrant Service* (JMS) and *Jesuit Refugee Service* (JRS) as an example of everyday humanitarian diplomacy to protect the rights of displaced people and people crossing the border. The JMS and JRS missions are negotiating with national and international political structures. C. Muguruza is convinced that representing the interests of the most vulnerable is a form of humanitarian diplomacy in a broad sense.¹⁰³ Head of the Norwegian Refugee Council J. Egellan believes that his organization carries out humanitarian diplomacy, establishing a million contacts a year in 30 countries.¹⁰⁴ As UN Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees Kelly Clements emphasized, the purpose of humanitarian diplomacy is to protect, assist, and find solutions for refugees, internally displaced people, and stateless people.¹⁰⁵

J. Wiseman described the systematic interaction between state structures and non-state representatives as the third dimension of diplomacy, which he called “multilateralism.”¹⁰⁶ The concept of multilateral diplomacy provides a framework through which to analyze the behavior of NGOs towards the state as part of a new form of diplomacy.¹⁰⁷ Case studies in Cambodia, Lebanon, and Sierra Leone show how humanitarian agencies enter into negotiations with the most senior politicians, sometimes influencing the course of conflict, and the interest of the United States or EU member states in humanitarian action in countries affected by conflict demonstrates that it is difficult to separate it completely from the “realm of high politics.”¹⁰⁸ Smith came to the conclusion that, on the one

hand, the practice of humanitarian diplomacy could benefit from the systematic use of methods inherent in diplomacy in general, and on the other hand, successful examples of the activities of humanitarian institutions can teach state diplomacy to use the ability to negotiate with those with whom they may not share values and interests, to persuade, to seek, and to obtain “non-zero sum” solutions to conflicts that are considered unresolvable.¹⁰⁹ Humanitarian diplomacy has become necessary due to the inability of traditional diplomats to address emerging issues adequately, as they are not always able to cope with modern global challenges, and humanitarian negotiators are becoming increasingly influential diplomatic actors.

THE MAIN ACTORS OF HUMANITARIAN DIPLOMACY

The available publications present a wide panorama of subjects that the authors refer to as “humanitarian diplomats.” As noted, “diplomacy has acquired unprecedented complexity,” especially with the emergence of “many new diplomats—private corporations, humanitarian organizations, and transnational political players who operate from above, below, and in parallel with the state.”¹¹⁰

The ICRC continues to be a key player in the humanitarian field. Its subjectivity is determined by the mandate assigned by state parties to the Geneva Conventions of 1949. It gives the ICRC a functional international legal personality that allows it to have a diplomatic status: exemption from taxes and duties, inviolability of premises and documents, immunity from jurisdiction, observer status in the UN General Assembly, and no obligation to testify in courts. However, this international legal personality is limited to the functions of providing relief and protection to victims of conflict. They include a number of activities in the areas of health and sanitation, food, security, search for missing persons, etc. In their implementation, the ICRC uses persuasion through discreet and confidential negotiations.¹¹¹

Another active player in modern humanitarian diplomacy is the UN. Humanitarian assistance is provided by the UNHCR, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, UNICEF,

¹⁰³Muguruza, C.C., *Everyday humanitarian diplomacy: Experiences from border areas*, CMI: CHR. Michelsen Institute. <https://www.cmi.no/publications/7171-everyday-humanitarian-and-diplomacy-experiences-from-border-areas>. Cited May 10, 2021.

¹⁰⁴Humanitarian Diplomacy: Interview with Jan Egeland. <https://www.cmi.no/publications/7373-humanitarian-diplomacy-interview-with-jan-egeland>. Cited May 10, 2021.

¹⁰⁵Humanitarian Diplomacy: An experienced practitioner addresses today's unprecedented challenges: Q&A With Kelly Clements, Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees. <https://afsa.org/humanitariananddiplomacy>. Cited July 17, 2021.

¹⁰⁶Wiseman, G., *Polyilateralism and new modes of global dialogue*, *Diplomacy*, vol. 3: *Problems and Issues in Contemporary Diplomacy*, Jonsson, C., and Langhorne, R., Eds., Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2004, pp. 24–39.

¹⁰⁷Spies, Y.K., *Polyilateralism and new modes of global dialogue*, *Global South Perspectives on Diplomacy*, Johannesburg: Palgrave Macmillan Cham, 2019, pp. 153–199.

¹⁰⁸Smith, H., *Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice*, *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Min-ear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, p. 37.

¹⁰⁹Smith, H., *Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice*, *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Min-ear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, pp. 42, 50.

¹¹⁰Constantinou, C.M., Kerr, P., and Sharp, P., *Understanding diplomatic practice*, *The SAGE Handbook of Diplomacy*, Constantinou, C., Kerr, P., and Sharp, P., Eds., London: SAGE Publications, 2016, p. 6.

¹¹¹Harroff-Tavel, M., *The humanitarian diplomacy of the International Committee of the Red Cross*, *Relations Internationales*, 2005, no. 121, Spring (January–March), p. 78.

the United Nations Development Programme, the World Food Programme, and the World Health Organization (WHO), whose staff can truly be called “humanitarian diplomats,” as they have diplomatic immunity and can negotiate. In 1991, the organization of humanitarian action within the United Nations became more institutionalized with the creation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). It provides the clearest example of the incorporation of humanitarian goals and practices into UN institutions. In 2005, the OCHA launched a humanitarian reform initiative. It was suggested that the role of the Office be strengthened as the body responsible for the overall organization of the global humanitarian system in order to maximize synergy and interaction between different actors. In addition, it was planned to create a UN cluster mechanism to respond, consisting of thematic groups with the participation of UN agencies, the ICRC, and international organizations and NGOs in areas such as food security, early recovery, emergency shelters, nutrition, water, sanitation, hygiene, health, and education.¹¹²

Thus, in the 21st century, an international humanitarian complex has been formed, covering a set of measures to provide assistance to victims of armed conflicts, natural disasters, or man-made disasters. These measures are aimed at relieving suffering, securing livelihoods, protecting the basic rights and dignity of vulnerable groups, and sometimes slowing down the process of social and economic destructuring of society. The UN has become a space for discussion and decision-making, as well as cooperation, among member states on important issues such as international peace and security, IHL, economic and social development, humanitarian issues, and human rights.

Along with the humanitarian organizations personnel, representatives of business, journalists, and clergymen of various faiths take part in the political dialogue.¹¹³ They find themselves embroiled in both international and domestic conflicts.¹¹⁴

The use of the term “humanitarian diplomacy” is not limited to civil society organizations and UN agencies. It is increasingly being used by states simultaneously with the growth of humanitarian aid on a

global scale.¹¹⁵ The humanitarian diplomacy of states and integration associations is of great interest to researchers.¹¹⁶ The authors tried to identify national and regional models of humanitarian diplomacy. E.S. Gromoglasova, after analyzing the activities of the United States, Australia, Japan, Canada, the EU member states, and the BRICS countries, concluded that the humanitarian diplomacy of these states “is a means of strengthening their international positions and in some cases a step towards achieving regional leadership with the help of ‘soft power’ means.”¹¹⁷ J. O’Hagan noted that humanitarian diplomacy as an element of foreign policy provides states with an opportunity to express international empathy and solidarity and can enhance the reputation of a state and provide valuable tools for building relationships of trust and cooperation. However, the inclusion of humanitarian diplomacy in foreign policy can lead to conflict due to contradictions between humanitarian goals and broader national interests. A classic example of this dissonance is the controversial position of states regarding the reception of refugees. For example, in 2013 Australia took tough action against forced migrants. Asylum seekers who arrived in the country were sent to special camps without considering applications for refugee status. This policy towards asylum

¹¹⁵According to UN OCHA forecasts, in 2022, 274 million people will be in need of humanitarian assistance and protection. This is significantly more than 235 million people in 2021, already the highest figure in two decades. The UN and partner organizations are committed to helping the 183 million people most in need in 63 countries, at a cost of \$41 billion. In 2021, OCHA set out to provide assistance to 160 million people from 56 countries. (Global Humanitarian Overview 2022, OCHA Services. <https://gho.unocha.org/>. Cited December 30, 2021.)

¹¹⁶Gromoglasova, E.S., *Humanitarian diplomatiya v sovremennyy mezhdunarodnyh otnosheniyakh: opyt sistemnogo issledovaniya* (Humanitarian Diplomacy in Modern International Politics: A Systemic View), Moscow: IMEMO RAN, 2018, pp. 41–51; Bogatyreva, O.N., Kozykina, N.V., and Tabarinceva-Romanova, K.M., Humanitarian Diplomacy of European Union in the 21st century, *Nauchnyi dialog*, 2018, no. 4, pp. 191–204; O’Hagan, J., Australia and the promise and the perils of humanitarian diplomacy, *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 2016, vol. 70, Issue 6: Australian Diplomacy Affairs, pp. 1–13; Dobrowolska-Polak, J., Humanitarian diplomacy of the European Union, *Open Europe: Cultural Dialogue Across Borders*, vol. 5: *New Diplomacy in Open Europe*, Curylo, B., Kulska, J., and Trzcielińska-Polus, A., Eds., Opole: University of Opole, 2014, pp. 115–126; Davutoğlu, A., Turkey’s humanitarian diplomacy: Objectives, challenges, and prospects, *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 2013, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 865–870; Brysk, A., *Global Good Samaritans: Human Rights as Foreign Policy*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 20–22; Marcos, F.R., La diplomacia humanitaria en el escenario internacional actual: algunas tendencias y su incidencia en el caso Español, *Nuevos planteamientos en diplomacia: la diplomacia humanitaria* (New Approaches in Diplomacy: Humanitarian Diplomacy), Marty, A. and Sancho, L., Eds., Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2020, pp. 65–78.

¹¹⁷Gromoglasova, E.S., *Humanitarian diplomatiya v sovremennyy mezhdunarodnyh otnosheniyakh: opyt sistemnogo issledovaniya* (Humanitarian Diplomacy in Modern International Politics: A Systemic View), Moscow: IMEMO RAN, 2018, p. 53.

¹¹²Colombo, S., Calvento, L., Di Megilo, M., Nicolao, J., Sarthou, N., Di Lorenzo, D., and Sol Herrero, M., *Asistencia humanitaria y política exterior Argentina: a una década del nuevo paradigma en la región Latinoamericana y Caribeña 2003–2013*, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, 2014, p. 45.

¹¹³Krashennnikova, E.A., Religious diplomacy in the settlement of the Afghan conflict: Opportunities and limitations, *Vestnik RUDN: International relations*, 2019, vol. 19, no 4, pp. 533–544.

¹¹⁴Smith, H., Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Mear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, p. 36.

seekers has led to the question of Australia's ability to gain a seat on the UN Human Rights Council.¹¹⁸ In connection with the possibility of such a conflict, O'Hagan proposed to distinguish between humanitarian diplomacy and humanism¹¹⁹ as diplomacy (*humanitarian diplomacy and humanitarianism as diplomacy*), since humanitarian diplomacy is "at the intersection of two key concepts and practices in world politics: humanity and diplomacy."¹²⁰ De Laury noted that the humanitarian diplomacy of states "has a significant tension": the public image of humanitarian activity is associated with work in the name of universal principles, regardless of the interests of individual political actors.¹²¹

Humanitarian diplomacy is sometimes used for inappropriate purposes, as a tool for implementing a power strategy. Under the pretext of ensuring human security, states carry out armed interventions. For example, when civil war resumed in Côte d'Ivoire after the 2010 presidential election, mass protests and confrontation began between supporters of the two presidents, between Christians and Muslims. Nicolas Sarkozy, who served as Prime Minister of France, ordered armed intervention in this country under the pretext of ensuring human security. In the media, this was described as humanitarian intervention and humanitarian negotiations, while, according to A. Abenza, this was more in line with the political and economic interests of the French government.¹²² Such a strategy illustrates the securitization of humanitarian activity, which is becoming one of the problems of modern humanitarian diplomacy.

Finding out the incentives for the participation of states in humanitarian diplomacy, researchers note that it provides opportunities for strengthening relations and creating a basis for cooperation, including between the warring parties.¹²³ Nevertheless, most often the goals of humanitarian diplomacy depend on the foreign policy pursued by the state. Humanitarian assistance provided by governments may not be an end in itself, but a way to maintain and strengthen security, as well as to resolve regional conflicts.

In a number of cases, the actions of states are determined by status motives. As A. Davutoğlu has shown, Turkey's identity as a humanitarian player is an important part of its international image as a responsible state.¹²⁴ In recent years, along with the provision of humanitarian assistance in the traditional sense (food, medicine), Turkey has been increasing its technological assistance to developing countries in the context of the concept of sustainable development. Professor T. Oguzlu notes that the humanitarian diplomacy of Turkey, like that of a number of other states, is conceptually divided into two groups: (1) development assistance with a focus on economic assistance and (2) humanitarian assistance to overcome the consequences of wars and natural disasters.¹²⁵ At the same time, the second category significantly dominates the first one in terms of public funding. Thus, about 1% of

¹¹⁸O'Hagan, J., Australia and the promise and the perils of humanitarian diplomacy, *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 2016, vol. 70, no. 6: Australian Diplomacy Affairs, pp. 666.

¹¹⁹J. O'Hagan believes that humanism in diplomacy is expressed in the protection and promotion of the interests of the state, while humanitarian diplomacy includes the actions of states taken to ensure maximum support for humanitarian operations. The difference lies in the imperatives that prompt action, whether these actions are taken in the interests of those who need help (humanitarian diplomacy) or the state itself (humanism). These two concepts often complement each other and are closely intertwined, but conceptually they are caused by different interests.

¹²⁰O'Hagan, J., Australia and the promise and the perils of humanitarian diplomacy, *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 2016, vol. 70, no. 6: Australian Diplomacy Affairs, pp. 657–659.

¹²¹De Lauri, A., *Humanitarianism: An Overview*, Chr. Michelsen Institute, 2021. <https://www.cmi.no/publications/7782-humanitarianism-an-overview>. Cited July 10, 2020.

¹²²"Ivory Coast: Fall of a despot. Editorial," *The Guardian*, April 12, 2011. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentis-free/2011/apr/12/editorial-ivory-coast-gbagbo-france>. Cited August 21, 2021; Myasnikov, V., The French ended the civil war in Côte d'Ivoire: The decisive contribution to the victory of Ouattara was made by the French troops, *Independent military review*, April 29, 2011. https://nvo.ng.ru/wars/2011-04-29/11_cote_d_ivoir.html. Cited August 21, 2021.

¹²³Gromoglasova, E.S., *Humanitarian diplomatiya v sovremennykh mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh: opyt sistemnogo issledovaniya* (Humanitarian Diplomacy in Modern International Politics: A Systemic View), Moscow: IMEMO RAN, 2018, pp. 41–51; Bogatyreva, O.N., Kozykina, N.V., and Tabarinceva-Romanova, K.M., Humanitarian Diplomacy of European Union in the 21st century, *Nauchnyi dialog*, 2018, no. 4, pp. 191–204; O'Hagan, J., Australia and the promise and the perils of humanitarian diplomacy, *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 2016, vol. 70, no. 6: Australian Diplomacy Affairs, pp. 1–13; Dobrowolska-Polak, J., Humanitarian diplomacy of the European Union, *Open Europe: Cultural Dialogue Across Borders*, vol. 5: *New Diplomacy in Open Europe*, Curylo, B., Kulska, J., and Trzcielińska-Polus, A., Eds., Opole: University of Opole, 2014, pp. 115–126; Davutoğlu, A., Turkey's humanitarian diplomacy: Objectives, challenges, and prospects, *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 2013, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 865–870; Brysk, A., *Global Good Samaritans: Human Rights as Foreign Policy*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 20–22; Marcos, F.R., La diplomacia humanitaria en el escenario internacional actual: algunas tendencias y su incidencia en el caso Español, *Nuevos planteamientos en diplomacia: la diplomacia humanitaria* (New Approaches in Diplomacy: Humanitarian Diplomacy), Marty, A. and Sancho, L., Eds., Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2020, pp. 65–78.

¹²⁴Davutoğlu, A., Turkey's humanitarian diplomacy: Objectives, challenges, and prospects, *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 2013, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 115–116.

¹²⁵Making sense of Turkey's humanitarian diplomacy in the context of the emerging poly-centric world order: Analytical memorandum, Expert online seminar, April 13, 2021. https://cceis.hse.ru/data/2021/04/19/1376681519/Analytical%20memorandum_13%20April.pdf. Cited April 20, 2021; Humanitarian diplomacy of Turkey in the emerging polycentric world order. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ItYclpo_bUU. Cited April 20, 2021.

Turkey's GDP is allocated for humanitarian assistance. This exceeds similar expenditures of the budgets, for example, of the United States and Germany. In addition to economic motives, the choice of beneficiaries is determined by cultural and civilizational similarities, on the one hand, and religious proximity, on the other hand. The geographical scope of assistance reflects the historical belonging of the territories of the Ottoman Empire or the ethnic proximity of the living population and is explained by ideological concepts: the concept of predestination in Islam ("geography as destiny"), the connection of good relations between peoples in a given territory ("geography of the heart"), and the "geography of memory" belonging to the territory of the former Ottoman Empire.¹²⁶

As shown by D. Gekalp, in the UAE, philanthropy, charity, and humanitarian activities also have a civilizational foundation, grow from the Islamic philosophy and culture of giving and compassion, and define the state identity of the UAE at the international level. Humanism was singled out in the 1970s by the founding father of the state, Sheikh Zayed bin Sultan Al Nahyan, as an important aspect of national identity. It has since been institutionalized as humanitarian diplomacy, becoming part of the UAE's foreign policy.¹²⁷

Qatar is pursuing a combined humanitarian diplomacy that includes support for peace negotiations with active use of humanitarian and development assistance in cooperation with UNESCO, UNHCR, the WHO, and the Norwegian Refugee Council.

For Qatar's active participation in regional mediation in Sudan, Lebanon, Yemen, Syria, and other countries, analysts called it a "nonstop mediator."¹²⁸

Gromoglasova found that the states of the BRICS group, implementing alternative approaches to humanitarian diplomacy, subordinate them to strategic national interests and do not always focus on strengthening the stability of the global system.¹²⁹

¹²⁶ Making sense of Turkey's humanitarian diplomacy in the context of the emerging poly-centric world order: Analytical memorandum, Expert online seminar, April 13, 2021. https://cceis.hse.ru/data/2021/04/19/1376681519/Analytical%20memorandum_13%20April.pdf. Cited April 20, 2021; Humanitarian diplomacy of Turkey in the emerging polycentric world order. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ItYcl-po_bUU. Cited April 20, 2021.

¹²⁷ Gökalp, D., *The UAE's Humanitarian Diplomacy: Claiming State Sovereignty, Regional Leverage, and International Recognition*. Bergen: Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI Working Paper WP 2020:1). <https://www.cmi.no/publications/7169-the-uaes-humanitarian-diplomacy-claiming-statesovereignty>. Cited July 7, 2021.

¹²⁸ Barakat, S., *The Qatari spring: Qatar's emerging role in peace-making*, Kuwait Program on Development, Governance and Globalization in the Gulf States. London: London School of Economics and Political Science, 2012, <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/59266/>. Cited July 7, 2020.

¹²⁹ Gromoglasova, E.S., *Humanitarian diplomatiya v sovremennykh mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh: opyt sistemnogo issledovaniya* (Humanitarian Diplomacy in Modern International Politics: A Systemic View), Moscow: IMEMO RAN, 2018, pp. 46–50, 98.

The analysis of government strategic documents on humanitarian issues, many of which were prepared before the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul, allowed researchers to identify four approaches to humanitarian diplomacy. The first approach is related to the obligations undertaken by the state under international law, generally recognized international norms and principles: the humanitarian principles of the UN Charter and human rights agreements. The second is determined by upholding respect for IHL and humanitarian principles in various forums. The third approach involves the use of humanitarian diplomacy for coordination and dialogue between different subjects of international relations. The fourth approach links this notion to working on the ground and gaining access to affected communities through negotiations. Quite often, in state documents, humanitarian diplomacy is associated with the development and achievement of the SDGs.¹³⁰

Summarizing the studies that touch upon the specifics of national models, we can highlight the following areas of humanitarian diplomacy of states: (1) provision of humanitarian and economic assistance; (2) protection of the civilian population in regions experiencing wars, epidemics, and natural disasters; (3) peacebuilding and restoration of sociality in the conflict zones of the modern world; (4) providing people with food in regions with a difficult humanitarian situation; (5) fighting epidemics, including the HIV/AIDS epidemic and the COVID-19 pandemic; (6) debt relief for the poorest countries; (7) refugee protection and repatriation policy; (8) peacekeeping and humanitarian presence in zones of instability and open armed conflicts; (9) participation in the development of international treaties and promotion of knowledge about humanitarian principles and IHL; (10) dialogue with states in regions prone to the risk of natural disasters and armed conflicts; (11) protecting children in armed conflict, with UNICEF; and (12) ensuring that parties to armed conflict comply with IHL, especially in cyberspace.

The analysis carried out showed that global humanitarian problems can only be solved by the joint efforts of state and non-state actors. Protracted armed conflicts, mass flows of refugees, and the COVID-19 pandemic required the expansion of humanitarian actors, as well as the growth of humanitarian obligations of state diplomacy. This indicates the professionalization of the international humanitarian sphere, the actors of which use traditional diplomatic means—dialogue, negotiations and compromise—to expand the humanitarian space. The field of activity of non-

¹³⁰ Marcos, F.R., *La diplomacia humanitaria en el escenario internacional actual: algunas tendencias y su incidencia en el caso Español*, *Nuevos planteamientos en diplomacia: la diplomacia humanitaria* (New Approaches in Diplomacy: Humanitarian Diplomacy), Marty, A. and Sancho, L., Eds., Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2020, p. 73.

state humanitarian actors, in addition to negotiations, also includes humanitarian–political advocacy, that is, the representation and protection of the rights of victims of conflicts and crises. At the same time, it should be noted that non-state actors have greater political independence, in contrast to state humanitarian actors. Humanitarian diplomacy of states, *firstly*, is an important component of “soft power,” having its own unique “face.” *Secondly*, the provision of assistance to the affected territories and the protection of vulnerable persons outside their state borders depend not only on the foreign policy course, but also on the universal international obligations taken to reduce the excessive suffering of people and the violation of their rights, and may also be due to cultural and civilizational traditions.

* * *

Humanitarian diplomacy was formed as an independent direction of diplomatic activity, focused on the issues of protection and assistance to populations in conditions of both natural and man-made disasters. Examples of humanitarian crises caused by natural disasters and the growth of internal armed conflicts, which have been protracted and exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, confirm the contribution of humanitarian diplomacy as a form of transnational public activity that promotes the interaction of diverse actors to achieve results in protecting and assisting the affected populations. Despite the ethical, legal, and operational challenges that humanitarian diplomacy faces, it is an effective tool for creating humanitarian space, negotiating, gathering resources, developing political–humanitarian influence, and creating a system of formal and informal partnerships necessary for the ever-expanding scope of humanitarian action. Guided by humanitarian principles, IHL and IHRL can state that many stakeholders are involved, interacting with actors such as nonstate armed groups, negotiations with which are neglected in the implementation of many other forms of diplomacy.

Going beyond humanitarian aid, modern humanitarian diplomacy acquires a multimodal character, combining the principles of classical humanism and the humanism of sustainability, as well as relying on the coordinated interaction of state and nonstate actors. Today, humanitarian practice is not only about providing humanitarian assistance, and supporting and accompanying people affected by emergencies, armed conflicts, climate change or poverty, but also about rebuilding communities without compromising development prospects and achieving the SDGs. The humanitarian diplomacy of states, pursuing the goal of creating a positive national image, uses a combination of various tools and may include humanitarian assistance, social policy, and economic and technological assistance in the context of sustainable development.

The works of researchers show that humanitarian diplomacy differs from other types of diplomacy in that it is able to cope with emergencies and overcome deep disagreements to resolve situations that were previously considered intractable.¹³¹ At the same time, it should be noted that knowledge about the content of the concept of humanitarian diplomacy is not systematized, especially in the context of new trends in world political development. The forms of its implementation remain poorly studied. Until now, there has been no unity in determining its place in the official diplomacy of modern states and its relationship with national foreign policy, or the influence of the political agenda on humanitarian diplomacy. Despite the presence of works that touch upon issues of humanitarian diplomacy, there are practically no Russian studies in which a comprehensive analysis of this phenomenon has been carried out or in which its national and civilizational manifestations have been studied.¹³² An empirical analysis of the humanitarian diplomacy of states, and above all Russia, of its methods and the specific consequences of its implementation is required. Further research is required on the diplomacy of non-state actors, the limits of their influence on public policy, and their ability to act in different political environments. In addition, a revision of the methodology is needed, since the concept of humanitarian diplomacy has been significantly expanded and has acquired new meanings, thus necessitating new research tools.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project no. 20-014-00033 A, “The Concept of Polymodal Humanitarian Diplomacy: Implementation, Tools, and Civilizational Models.”

REFERENCES

- Barrichello, S.E., Refugee protection and responsibility sharing in Latin America: solidarity programmes and the Mexico Plan of Action, *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 2015, vol. 20, issue 2, pp. 191–207.
- Barnett, M., Human rights, humanitarianism, and the practices of humanity, *International Theory*, 2018, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 314–349.
- ¹³¹ Ryfman, Ph., L’action humanitaire non gouvernementale: une diplomatie alternative?, *Politique étrangère*, 2010, no. 3, pp. 565–578.
- ¹³² Bogatyreva, O.N., Kozykina, N.V., and Tabarinceva-Romanova, K.M., Humanitarian Diplomacy of European Union in the 21st century, *Nauchnyi dialog*, 2018, no. 4, pp. 191–204; Gromoglasova, E.S., *Humanitarian diplomatiya v sovremennykh mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh: opyt sistemnogo issledovaniya* (Humanitarian Diplomacy in Modern International Politics: A Systemic View), Moscow: IMEMO RAN, 2018; Kovba, D.M., The humanitarian dimension of diplomacy: The problem of categorization and analysis, *Herald of KRSU*, 2020, vol. 20, no. 11, pp. 169–174.

- Bogatyreva, O.N., Kozykina, N.V., and Tabarinceva-Romanova, K.M., Humanitarian Diplomacy of European Union in the 21st century, *Nauchnyi dialog*, 2018, no. 4, pp. 191–204.
- Borgomeo, E., Delivering water services during protracted armed conflicts: How development agencies can overcome barriers to collaboration with humanitarian actors, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 2019, vol. 101, no. 912, pp. 1067–1089.
- Brysk, A., *Global Good Samaritans: Human Rights as Foreign Policy*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Carpi, E., Emergency, *Humanitarianism: Keywords*, A. De Lauri, Ed., Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2020, pp. 57–58.
- Chandler, D., The Road to Military Humanitarianism: How the Human Rights NGOs Shaped a New Humanitarian Agenda, *Human Rights Quarterly*, 2001, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 678–700.
- Chernykh, N.A., Humanitarian diplomacy as a tool of social conflict resolution, *Voprosy upravleniya*, 2016, no. 3 (40), pp. 133–138.
- Clark, M.D., *Humanitarian Multi-track Diplomacy: Conceptualizing the Definitive, Particular, and Critical Role of Diplomatic Function in Humanitarian Action*, Groningen: University of Groningen, 2018.
- Clements, A.J., *The Frontlines of Diplomacy: Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups*. A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the Australian National University, 2018.
- Clements, A.J., Getting armed groups to the negotiating table, *CMJ Brief no. 2020:10*. <https://www.cmi.no/publications/7425-getting-armed-groups-to-the-negotiating-table>. Cited October 10, 2020.
- Colombo, S., Calvento, L., Di Megilo, M., Nicolao, J., Sarthou, N., Di Lorenzo, D., and Sol Herrero, M., *Asistencia humanitaria y política exterior Argentina: A una década del nuevo paradigma en la región Latinoamericana y Caribeña 2003–2013*, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, 2014.
- Constantinou, C.M., Kerr, P., and Sharp, P., Understanding diplomatic practice, *The SAGE Handbook of Diplomacy*, Constantinou, C., Kerr, P., and Sharp, P., Eds., London: SAGE Publications, 2016, pp. 1–10.
- Cornago, N., Diplomacias plurales: nuevas prácticas, instituciones y discursos, *Cursos de Derecho Internacional y Relaciones Internacionales de Vitoria-Gasteiz* (International Law and International Relations Courses in Vitoria-Gasteiz), Arocena, D., Ed., Thomson Reuter Aranzadi, 2017, pp. 83–111.
- Cornago, N., Repensar la diplomacia humanitaria, *Nuevos planteamientos en diplomacia: La diplomacia humanitaria* (New Approaches in Diplomacy: Humanitarian Diplomacy), Martí, A. and Sancho, L., Eds., Madrid: Marcial Pons., 2020, pp. 29–42.
- Davutoğlu, A., Turkey's humanitarian diplomacy: Objectives, challenges, and prospects, *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 2013, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 865–870.
- Dobrowolska-Polak, J., Humanitarian diplomacy of the European Union, *Open Europe: Cultural Dialogue Across Borders*, vol. 5: *New Diplomacy in Open Europe*, Curylo, B., Kulska, J., and Trzcielińska-Polus, A., Eds., Opole: University of Opole, 2014, pp. 115–126.
- Fiott, D., Humanitarian diplomacy, *The Encyclopedia of Diplomacy*, Martel, G., Ed., Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2018, pp. 1–10.
- Global Diplomacy: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*, Balzacq, T., Charillon, F., and Ramel, F., Eds., Paris: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020.
- Gordon, S. and Donini, A., (2015). Romancing principles and human rights: Are humanitarian principles salvageable?, *International Review of The Red Cross*, 2015, vol. 97, no. 897–898, p. 77–109.
- Gromoglasova, E.S., *Humanitarian diplomatiya v sovremennykh mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyakh: opyt sistemnogo issledovaniya* (Humanitarian Diplomacy in Modern International Politics: A Systemic View), Moscow: IME-MO RAN, 2018.
- Guinote, F.S., Q&A: The ICRC and the “humanitarian—development—peace nexus” discussion, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 2019, vol. 101, no. 912, pp. 1051–1066.
- Harroff-Tavel, M., The humanitarian diplomacy of the International Committee of the Red Cross, *Relations Internationales*, 2005, no. 121, Spring (January–March), pp. 72–89.
- Hillhorst, D., Classical humanitarianism and resilience humanitarianism: Making sense of two brands of humanitarian action, *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, 2018, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–12.
- Jonsson, C., Diplomacy, bargaining, and negotiation, *Handbook of International Relations*, Carlsnaes, W., Risse T., and Simmons, B., Eds., London: SAGE Publications, 2002, pp. 212–234.
- Kaldor, M., *New & Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Redwood City: Stanford University Press, 2012.
- Kovba, D.M., The humanitarian dimension of diplomacy: The problem of categorization and analysis, *Herald of KRSU*, 2020, vol. 20, no. 11, pp. 169–174.
- Krashennikova, E.A., Religious diplomacy in the settlement of the Afghan conflict: Opportunities and limitations, *Vestnik RUDN: International relations*, 2019, vol. 19, no 4, pp. 533–544.
- Lebedeva, M.M., Social and humanitarian issues in international studies: The Russian perspective, *MGIMO Review of International Relations*, 2018, no. 1 (58), pp. 114–130.
- Lebedeva, M.M. and Ustinova, M.I., The humanitarian and social agenda of the UN Security Council, *International Organizations Research Journal*, 2020, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 135–154.
- Leira, H.A., Conceptual History of Diplomacy, *The SAGE Handbook of Diplomacy*, Constantinou C., Kerr P., and Sharp, P., Eds., London: SAGE Publications, 2016, pp. 28–38.
- Mc Hugh, G. and Besler, M., *Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups: A Manual for Practitioners*, United Nations, January 2006. <https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/dms/Documents/Humanitarian-NegotiationswArmedGroupsManual.pdf>. Cited August 25, 2021.
- Macrae, J., The death of humanitarianism? An anatomy of the attack, *Disasters*, 1998, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 309–317.

- Mancini-Griffoli, D. and Picot, A., *Humanitarian negotiation: A Handbook for Securing Access, Assistance, and Protection for Civilians in Armed Conflict*, Geneva: Center for Humanitarian Dialogue, 2004.
- Marcos, F.R., La diplomacia humanitaria en el escenario internacional actual: algunas tendencias y su incidencia en el caso Español, *Nuevos planteamientos en diplomacia: la diplomacia humanitaria* (New Approaches in Diplomacy: Humanitarian Diplomacy), Marty, A. and Sancho, L., Eds., Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2020, pp. 65–78.
- Minear, L. and Smith, H., Introduction, *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Minear, L. and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, pp. 1–5.
- Modirzadeh, N.K., Lewis, D.A., and Bruderlein, C., Humanitarian engagement under counterterrorism: A conflict of norms and the emerging policy landscape, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 2011, vol. 93, no. 883.
- Mullerson, R., *Human Rights Diplomacy*, London: Routledge, 1997.
- Nikolson, G., *Diplomatiya* (Diplomacy), Moscow: OGIZ, 1941.
- O'Hagan, J., Australia and the promise and the perils of humanitarian diplomacy, *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 2016, vol. 70, Issue 6: Australian Diplomacy Affairs, pp. 1–13.
- Pease, K.K., Introduction to human rights and humanitarian diplomacy, *Human Rights and Humanitarian Diplomacy*, Pease, K., Ed., Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020, pp. 1–18.
- Pentegova, A.V., The concept of humanitarian cooperation in the modern system of international relations, *Vestnik Zabaikal'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 2019, no. 4, pp. 54–60.
- Regnier, Ph., The emerging concept of humanitarian diplomacy: Identification of a community of practice and prospects for international recognition, *International Review of the Red Cross*, 2011, vol. 93, no. 884, pp. 1211–1237.
- Riff, D., *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002.
- Rusakova, O.F. and Rusakov, V.M., Soft power as the instrument of political communications and humanitarian diplomacy, *Diskurs-Pi*, 2017, no. 1 (26), pp. 61–71.
- Rousseau, E. and Pende, A., Humanitarian diploma, *Global Diplomacy: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*, Balzacq, T., Charillon, F., and Ramel, F., Eds., Paris: Palgrave Macmillan 2020, pp. 253–266.
- Ryfman, Ph., L'action humanitaire non gouvernementale: une diplomatie alternative?, *Politique étrangère*, 2010, no. 3, pp. 565–578.
- Sharp, P., Mullah Zaeef and Taliban diplomacy: An English school approach, *Review of International Studies*, 2003, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 481–498.
- Singh, N., Armed conflicts and humanitarian laws of ancient India, *Studies and Essays on International Humanitarian Law and Red Cross Principles*, Swinarski, C., Ed., The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1985, pp. 531–536.
- Slim, H., Humanitarian diplomacy: The ICRC's neutral and impartial advocacy in armed conflicts, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 2019, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 67–77.
- Smith, H., Humanitarian diplomacy: theory and practice, *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, Minear, L., and Smith, H., Eds., Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007, pp. 36–62.
- Spies, Y.K., Polylateral diplomacy: Diplomacy as public–private collaboration, *Global South Perspectives on Diplomacy*, Johannesburg: Palgrave Macmillan Cham, 2019, pp. 153–199.
- Straus, O.S., Wheeler, E.P., Theodore, P.I., Lange, C.L., Marbug, T., and Wheless, J., “Humanitarian diplomacy of the United States,” *Proceedings of the American Society of International Law at Its Annual Meetings (1907–1917)*, 1912, vol. 6, pp. 45–59.
- Tabak, H., Broadening the nongovernmental humanitarian mission: The IHH and mediation, *Insight Turkey*, 2015, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 193–215.
- Toros, H., Legitimacy and complexity in terrorist conflicts, *Security Dialogue*, 2008, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 407–426.
- Turunen, S., Humanitarian diplomatic practice, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2020, vol. 15, pp. 459–487.
- Velikaya, A., The Russian approach to public diplomacy and humanitarian cooperation, *Rising Powers Quarterly*, 2018, no. 3(3), pp. 39–61.
- Wiseman, G., Diplomatic practices at the United Nations, *Cooperation and Conflict*, 2015, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 316–333.
- Wiseman, G., Polylateralism and new modes of global dialogue, *Diplomacy*, vol. 3: *Problems and Issues in Contemporary Diplomacy*, Jonsson, C., and Langhorne, R., Eds., Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2004, pp. 409–430.
- Zinovskii, Yu.G., Multilateral diplomacy and peacekeeping in the world of today, *Vestnik MGIMO University*, 2010, no. 6 (15), pp. 65–74.
- Zonova, T.V., Limits of coercive diplomacy in international conflicts: The case of Libya, *Mezhdunarodnye protsessy*, 2017, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 35–48.
- Zonova, T.V., Conflicts or Consensus: Diplomacy as a Means to Achieve Peace, *Kul'tura tolerantnosti: opyt diplomatii dlya resheniya sovremennykh upravlencheskikh problem* (A Culture of Tolerance: Diplomatic Experience for Solving Contemporary Management Problems), Tiulin, I.G., Ed., Moscow: MGIMO University, 2004, pp. 215–241.