

# The Study of Modern Diplomacy

Durbek Sayfullaev<sup>a</sup>

*Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies, Tashkent, Uzbekistan*

**Keywords:** Leaders and Governments, Diplomacy, Non-Military, “Ambassador”, “Servant”, “Slave”, “Resident Speaker”, Foreign Affairs Institutions.

**Abstract:** By the end of the 20th century, under the influence of the globalization process, the problem of international relations became one of the pressing problems that stood out both in theoretical and practical terms, requiring in-depth and comprehensive research. In fact, the topic of international relations is the constant focus of attention of representatives of the social and human sciences. In particular, the historical study of diplomacy, embodying its integral and important facet, is one of the keys to solving many complex problems in political, economic and cultural relations between countries at the global and regional levels. Based on this, first of all, we should dwell on the issue of defining the phenomenon of diplomacy and clarify the discussion around this concept.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Diplomacy, which is the subject of our study, is a very complex phenomenon, and the process, of action is its main feature. In most sources, diplomacy is defined as the activity of the government and its special bodies to implement the state’s foreign policy and protect the interests of the state and its citizens abroad - Popov V.I. (2000).

In the diplomatic dictionary, diplomacy is a non-military means of implementing the state’s foreign policy, a set of practical measures, methods and ways used taking into account the specific conditions and the nature of the tasks being solved; defined as the official activities of state leaders and governments, ministers of foreign affairs, foreign affairs institutions, diplomatic missions abroad in the implementation of the goals and tasks of the state foreign policy, protection of the rights and interests of the state, its institutions and citizens abroad - M. Nauka (1984).


The question of the origin of the word “diplomat” has also been solved in science, which clearly expresses its meaning: it comes from the Greek word “diploma”, which means official documents (credentials). In ancient Greece, these documents were presented to ambassadors as their letters of attorney and authorized them to act on behalf of the ruler.

Historians of diplomacy believe that the concept of “ambassador” appears for the first time in the writings of Julius Caesar (102-44 BC) “On the Gallic War”. The Celtic word “ambassador” originally meant “servant”, or “slave”. It is known that a military commander or a ruler used to send his trusted people to the other side with a name and said, “I am sending you my servant.” Printers, heralds and ambassadors delivered the names of their rulers to other countries. The word “ambassador” has been used in European countries since the middle of the 16th century to mean a permanent representative of the state. Before that, diplomatic representatives in Italy were called “resident speakers” - Akhtamzyan A. (2001).

The above-mentioned examples represent the situation of this concept in a narrow sense (within the scope of foreign policy). According to experts, the concept of “diplomacy” in a broad sense represents the process of communication and representation, which establishes mutual relations and relations between not only states but also various entities and individuals - Strezhneva M.V., & et. al. (2016).

## 2 THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

In general, the concept of “diplomacy”, which embodies a special professional activity, was

<sup>a</sup> <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-9763-6942>

recorded in history in the English-language sources related to chamber studies and state administration in 1645 - Nechaeva Yu. (2011). Since 1693, “diplomatic” has entered international relations as a concept reflecting issues of relations between sovereign countries in Leibniz’s Code of International Diplomatic Law, since this period, under the influence of changes in international relations, the meaning of the term “diplomacy” has been enriched - Durdyeva A. (2017). The term in its current sense was first used by the French diplomat Francois Kahler, who was the ambassador of Louis XIV - Popov V.I. (2000).

Although the term “diplomat” is used to denote a person holding a document authorizing him to act on behalf of his sovereign, the diploma as a double-folded piece of paper or a double-sided writing board with text has existed since ancient times. According to historians, the concepts of “diplomacy” and “diplomat” were widely used in relations between states only in the 18th century. But this does not mean that the concepts of “diplomacy” and “diplomat” appeared long after the concept of “foreign policy”.

Diplomacy, used as a means of foreign policy between states and governments in various historical periods, is recognized as an ancient phenomenon in connection with wars. The oldest known contract dates back to the 13th century BC. In 1278 BC, the Egyptian pharaoh Ramses II made a peace treaty with the Hittite ruler Hattushil III after a long and devastating war. According to legends, its text was engraved on silver pieces, and both in form and structure, this treaty became a model for other countries. It has an introduction (i.e. preamble) in which the purpose of the contract is stated. In addition, the agreement contains a number of decisions - the obligations of the parties and the covenant of loyalty to the commitments - which can be seen in the following lines: “All the thousand gods and goddesses inscribed on the silver pieces of the land of the Hittites, as well as all the thousand gods and goddesses of Egypt, undertake the obligations of state ambassadorship. They are witnesses of my words” - Selyaninov O.P. (1998).

In this regard, political scientist M. Kyrgyzboev, relying on German-language sources, cites the following facts: “Human civilization is 56 centuries long, of which only three centuries passed peacefully. In history, it is recorded that 8 thousand peace agreements were concluded (probably approximately), and most of them were concluded for “eternal periods”. But their average validity period did not exceed 10 years”.

It should be noted that diplomatic actions as an action aimed at preventing wars arose long before the concept of “diplomat”. As experts have noted, diplomacy is one of the methods of implementing the state's foreign policy, a set of non-military practical measures. Diplomacy is carried out directly by diplomats in the form of official activities of heads of state, governments, and foreign relations agencies of states, and to achieve the goals and objectives of foreign policy, as well as to protect the interests of their country and its citizens abroad. Today, when defining diplomacy, it is always emphasized that it is a set of forces and tools of governmental and non-governmental institutions and institutions that regulate international relations without the use of force. In the last hundred years, diplomacy has made it possible to maintain a balance in the system of international relations in order to prevent one country from trying to occupy a dominant position and chaos and leadership among all countries. As Der Derian points out, modern diplomacy has emerged as a collective and emotional reflection of states’ ultimate goal of self-preservation in a hostile environment.

The views of the British theoretician scientist G. Nicholson, who made a significant contribution to the study of the phenomenon of diplomacy, are expressed in the Oxford Dictionary. It is emphasized that “diplomacy is conducting international relations through negotiations; the manner in which negotiations are conducted by ambassadors and representatives is the task or art of a diplomat”.

One of the leading experts in the field of international law Sh. Martens said: “Diplomacy is the science of foreign relations or foreign affairs of the state, and in a narrower sense, it is the science or art of negotiation”. The famous British diplomat E. Satou believes: “Diplomacy is the use of reason and decency to conduct official relations between the governments of independent countries, in short, it is the conduct of business between countries by peaceful means.”

Accordingly, the theory of modern diplomacy structurally and functionally includes consideration of the following issues: 1) the establishment of diplomatic relations and the creation of diplomatic missions; 2) organizing the work of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to manage diplomatic missions and the diplomatic corps; 3) organization and structure of diplomatic missions; 4) protocol and procedures; 5) diplomatic privileges and immunities; 6) consular service; 7) multilateral diplomacy and international organizations; 8) international law and relevant practice; 9) organization and holding of conferences; 10) cooperation with mass media; 11) humanitarian

and cultural cooperation; 12) organization of information-analytical work and its directions.

So, diplomacy is a complex method of implementing the state's foreign policy, as well as a multilateral mechanism that allows the state to have guaranteed and equal participation in international relations based on international law and appropriate order.

Diplomacy is often studied as a process, a historical phenomenon, along with the factors influencing it in different historical periods. Foreign policy is one such important factor and encompasses diplomacy. Therefore, without studying it, it will not be possible to understand diplomacy as a subject of research and a concrete phenomenon of social relations.

In addition, diplomacy is integral to the methods and tools developed in foreign policy, existing concepts, orientations, and research conducted within schools. In addition to classic concepts such as realism, neorealism, and institutionalism, non-classical theories such as neo-Marxism, the French sociological school, and constructivism are also considered. At the same time, diplomacy has travelled a long historical path of development, reflecting scientific-analytical approaches and methods based on information media, public speaking, and jurisprudence.

The category "foreign policy" cannot be imagined without the system of international relations, because the system of international relations is formed within the framework of the foreign policy of the states that are considered its main participants. Foreign policy is a tool that ensures the realization of the relations of a certain country with other countries, needs and interests in the international arena.

Based on the above-mentioned points, we should pay special attention to the gradual development of the theory of international relations. In particular, despite the fact that international relations have existed for a long time, this expression appeared relatively recently. According to the sources, the concept of "international relations", which refers to political relations at the core, was introduced into the scientific and political sphere by the English philosopher J. Bentham.

According to some experts, the concept of "international relations" in the modern interpretation means a set of economic, political, ideological, legal, diplomatic, military, cultural and other types of relations between states and (in a broad sense) peoples in the international framework.

The structure of international relations means a set of mechanisms driving international relations or some of their parts - the "internal structure", "location", and

"order" of the members of the world community, for example, "the balance of forces between the main subjects of the international community", "rules of behaviour between them", "means of establishing international relations", "international institutions as mechanisms of international cooperation" are understood.

"The structure of international relations" can also be understood as a clear ratio of forces that affect (or do not affect) decision-making that affects the stability of the entire system of international relations. According to its content, the concept of "structure of international relations" means various elements of this structure, including subjects, institutions, characteristics and forms of relations, location and ratio. At a certain historical stage, this structure represents the appropriate form of international relations. Such an approach to the definition of the "structure of international relations" corresponds to the concept of "international relations" itself, which is a form of interaction between members of different societies as a set of behaviour, regardless of whether it is directed by the state or not.

Just as the state of the market in the economy is determined by the influence of several large firms, the modern structure of international relations also depends on the ratio of large countries and the corresponding forces that they coordinate. Changes in the balance of these forces can lead to a transformation of the structure of the international system. However, in reality, the very nature of this system remains unchanged, since the number of great powers whose interests do not coincide is limited. Thus, the state of the structure of international relations shows its stability and change, cooperation or conflict relations. The laws of operation and change of the system of international relations are expressed in this way.

The theoretical study of international relations began after the end of the First World War. Experts point to the opening of the Department of International Relations at the University of Wales as the reason for the beginning of this process. The second wave of the development of the theory of international relations coincided with the end of the 30s of the 20th centuries. As well-known representatives of this wave, E. X. Carr and Hans Morgenthau can be cited. In the theory of international relations, which emerged between the two world wars and developed somewhat, the principle of collective security is given priority as the main rule of international politics.

If we dwell on the main concepts underlying the theory of international relations, it is necessary to note

realism first. The theory of realism or political realism, based on the works of Thucydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes, has dominated international relations since its inception. At the same time, several directions of realism were formed, among which the theories of “statism”, “survival” and “independence and maturity” should be highlighted.

If statism (in contrast to the liberal theory that gives priority to non-state organizations, interstate political structures and international organizations in international relations) is based on the belief that national states take the lead in international processes, then the theory of “survival” is that the international political system is governed by anarchy, therefore, international politics gives priority to national interests. Realists emphasize that it is based on the struggle between donor countries. Realists who are supporters of the third approach emphasize that in order to survive in international relations, it is impossible to rely on any partner, therefore, it is necessary for each country to work on itself, conduct an independent policy and protect its national interests. Generally speaking, realists assert that competition exists in international relations and that each state as an autonomous rational entity must fight for its security, interests, and sovereignty (including through diplomatic means) based on its own national interests.

Kenneth Waltz is the ideological leader of the neo-realism (or structural realism) direction, a modern theory formed on the basis of realism (his ideas were first expressed in the work “The Theory of International Politics”). Structural realism proposed by Waltz means structure, firstly, the system of international relations based on anarchy, and secondly, the distribution of their opportunities in relations between states. K. Waltz questions the realist approach to state power based solely on military power and instead proposes the concept of state power as a combination of different (social, cultural, economic, and political) domains.

Liberalism is one of the major and important directions in the theory of international relations, representatives of this direction say that the nature of the state is determined not by its capabilities, but by its priority interests. Liberalism, in contrast to realism (which considers the state as a unitary actor), notes that the state must rely on pluralistic actions in its activities. Therefore, the political regime and economic system of this or that country are taken into account in foreign relations based on its priority interests. Liberalism is not limited to the security of the state but implies the implementation of relations through structures, organizations and individuals engaged in business. Consequently, liberalism

recognizes international relations not as an anarchic system, but as a more complex structure.

For example, a country’s film industry can spread its culture to the world. This situation shows the potential and power of culture in international relations. Another tenet of this theory is the recognition that mutual benefit can only be achieved through cooperation and interaction. At the same time, the above-mentioned postulates are also the main factor of stability.

The neoliberal concept expresses the main ideas of liberalism, while at the same time, it develops organically with the process of globalization and recognizes that it penetrates into all aspects of the socio-economic life of countries. In this process, it is emphasized that the role of transnational corporations will increase, and the interests of the state will fall to the second level. The concept of post liberalism related to this theory gives priority to international organizations in international relations and further lowers the position of state interests.

A relatively new direction in the theory of international relations is the concept of constructivism, which was formed as a result of the fall of the Berlin Wall and the decline of the idea of communism in Western Europe. It arose on the basis of debates about scientific methods in the study of international relations and the role of theory in the formation of international forces. Constructivism is a theory that questions the ideas of neorealists and neoliberals.

Constructivism recognizes that international (foreign) policy is formed on the basis of uncontested ideas, collective values, culture and social identifications. Supporters of this direction prove that the reality happening in the international sphere is based on social values that give a new meaning to the material world (close to the idea of socialism). At the same time, constructivists recognize anarchy as a permanent consistency in the system of international relations and emphasize that it is not permanent and has subjective reasons. They prioritize social norms over national security in interstate relations.

The theory of Marxism and neo-Marxism emphasizes economic and material aspects in the system of international relations, without denying the concept of “state” of realists and liberals. Marxists recognize the international system as an integrated capitalist system focused on the accumulation of large amounts of funds (capital). In general, the mistake and shortcoming of the proponents of this theory is their one-sided approach.

Therefore, although the theory of international relations as a science was formed in the new and most

recent historical periods, it developed the concepts of studying the processes in international relations, including the theory and practice of diplomacy, from different perspectives. Up to now, in the theory of international relations, there are mainly two directions, that is, realism and liberalism.

It can be said that diplomacy is a tool and a component of foreign policy. Foreign policy, according to its tasks, is somewhat broader and multifaceted and is part of international relations. Foreign policy implemented by diplomatic means, in turn, is the art of managing state affairs in the system of international relations. The foreign policy of the state represents the main goals and tasks of its activity in international relations. In this sense, diplomacy emerges as one of the main means of achieving these tasks and goals.

Diplomacy is divided into economic, multilateral, parliamentary, regional, military, economic diplomacy, public diplomacy, etc. In fact, diplomacy cannot be studied without separating it from practice and without analysing the goals and tasks, principles and priorities of foreign policy. Only if there is a certain result in diplomatic activity, the mechanism, organizational and legal foundations of diplomacy can be of interest for research.

Diplomacy is interesting in terms of the effectiveness of foreign policy, and the achievement of military-political, economic, cultural and other goals and tasks of the state in the system of international relations. Among these goals and tasks, ensuring security and internal socio-economic growth emerges as the main tasks.

Most scholars of diplomacy and foreign policy come from this approach. For example, G. A. Khidoyatov, commenting on the difference between the concepts of “diplomacy” and “foreign policy”, also emphasized that diplomacy is a political tool for the implementation of foreign policy. Therefore, the official activity of state leaders, governments and special foreign relations agencies that implement the tasks and goals of the state’s foreign policy is called “diplomacy”. Also, the activity of protecting the rights and interests of the state abroad is a separate area of state activity. “Many international disasters have been accompanied by poorly executed or unscrupulous diplomacy. At the same time, many achievements in world politics and international relations have been achieved through outstanding diplomats and high-level diplomacy”.

At any historical stage, the tasks of diplomacy are directed to the implementation of the foreign policy strategy for the protection and promotion of foreign political interests. Strategy is created based on

guiding ideas, goals, principles and long-term interests. Interests arise as a reaction to the situation formed in the system of international relations and can be short-term or long-term.

In this context, when we talk about strategy, we mean the long-term benefits and values that must be realized for the desired result in the future, the possibilities and prospects of their implementation, risks and hidden difficulties, and the family tree (hierarchy) of goals.

National interests, in fact, consist of a set of specific political and economic priorities, goals and means of their implementation. National interests are mainly determined by the geopolitical status of the state in the region and in the world in general, the ratio (balance) of forces in the system of international relations and in the region, and its needs in the field of socio-economic development.

“Diplomacy” emerges as a basic concept determined by the priority of the goals and essence of foreign political activity, based on the term “national interests” applied to its tasks and the essence of diplomatic activity in general. From this point of view, diplomacy is not only a peaceful means of ensuring and protecting national interests but also their main representative in the international arena. National interests have the highest priority even in relation to legal norms. For example, according to the doctrine of “political realism” by J. Kenan and G. Morgenthau, “the iron law of international politics is that legal obligations must override national interests”.

If we consider that diplomacy is a task, that is, an activity related to the function of implementing or managing bilateral or multilateral relations, the protection and promotion of national interests is its main content. At the national level, as a rule, this task is entrusted to the ministries of foreign affairs, and it is carried out by professional diplomats working both inside the country and abroad (employees of embassies and permanent missions registered in international organizations and special institutions). But now, together with professional diplomats, representatives of other state and non-state organizations authorized by the country’s government to conduct negotiations can perform this task. At the international level, the management function is carried out by international organizations, which are mainly part of the UN system.

Analysis of recent studies and scientific publications shows that emerging scientific theories are causing serious debates due to their inability to adequately explain existing problems and reality. This situation can be explained by the emergence of



a number of competing views and scientific concepts that claim to explain and predict the changes that have taken place in the past decades and their impact on diplomacy, and the scientific debate between them is intensifying.

At the same time, it is necessary to note that the following principles prevail in international relations: the state is the main moving force (participant) of international relations; the emergence of new actors (non-governmental organizations, transnational corporations, etc.) in the international arena; recognition of the role of international law in almost all paradigms; the increasing role of the economy; recognition that today's world is becoming more globalized, although it is understood and evaluated differently in all paradigms.

Based on the above principles (tendencies), it is necessary to talk about the bi- and multi-polar world, which is the basis of the current conflicting international relations and is changing the world today. The end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, reflecting such processes, are distinguished by the incomparable geopolitical significance and scale of changes in the world. These are unprecedented changes, which require not only deep thinking but also a reassessment of views and mechanisms of mutual relations formed between countries; creating the need to develop completely new approaches to the study of modern international relations.

**Russian researcher S. Karaganov said, “The relatively orderly and stable period of confrontation, which intensified after the end of the Second World War, has come to an end. The end of the Cold War did not actually mean the beginning of a new order. At the present time, it seems that the situation on earth does not require a war of all against all, but the wave of fierce competition is growing”.** Also, according to the researcher, “the balance of power in international politics is changing and rapid redistribution is taking place. The rules of the second half of the 20th century, which the ideologues of the “unipolar state” wanted to de facto abolish - the inevitable respect for independence and territorial integrity, the overt non-interference in internal affairs, the respect for the interests and security spheres of the largest powers, really no longer work”.

**The above-mentioned expert stated that the following macro-principles (changes) indicate a transition to a new bipolar system. “There are new macro-principles emerging through the chaos, albeit less clearly, that seem likely to shape the future of the world”.**

The first of these is the emergence of a new bipolar system. Now two centres of world economy and politics are emerging. Realizing that its hopes of consolidating a unipolar world were fading, the US began to limit China's progress (mainly through economic and political means) and create a structure centred on itself. It should be noted that currently China is becoming one of the leading countries in the world in terms of economic power and is likely to become the first in the next decade. In the near future, in terms of GDP per capita and military potential, it may not overtake the United States, but it may close the gap between them.

Some experts believe that the use of a bipolar system model in assessing the emerging system of international relations is completely wrong. For example, F. Fukuyama's idea of “the end of history” did not justify itself. Because liberal-democratic values have spread to a certain extent, but they were immediately discredited by their sponsors and they are not expected to win in the near future, so the international system cannot be established in a proper way. S. Huntington's concept of “clash of civilizations” has not been confirmed on a global scale. Clashes of civilizations, however important, are neither the only nor the driving factor of the international system.

Experts predicted the first decade of the 20th century as the final stage of a “post-bipolar” transition that would culminate in a multipolar world. However, the change of the international political system has not come to an end, the increasing confrontation between the USA and Russia is causing new conflicts and destabilization of international relations.

The impact of the SCO on changes in the world order is gradually increasing. In particular, the accession of India and Pakistan to the SCO in 2016, and the prospects for membership of a number of other countries are being considered, causing geopolitical changes. While China plays the role of economic leadership in this organization, other powerful participants such as Russia, India, and Iran are able to balance its influence. This new centre for economic cooperation and security is becoming a kind of gesture for the West, which is trying to unite, but this does not mean that it is the polar opposite - cooperation and competition are dialectically combined.

Z. Brzezinski points to the unsurpassed status of the United States today in world politics and economics, asserting that it has indeed “become the first and only truly secular state”. Today's world is experiencing a political renaissance almost everywhere - millions of people are busy searching for a bright future. In

addition, there is a redistribution of power in the world, and several new contenders for a dominant position in world politics are emerging in the East. Therefore, today's world is less inclined to submit (even militarily) to a single state like the United States of America, which is powerful and politically influential.

In this situation, Huntington said, "The United States, together with Great Britain and France, will retain their position as great powers that make key decisions in the field of politics and security."

According to G. Kissinger, "the new model of the global economic order largely results from the nature of American Chinese relations in recent years." He also emphasizes that "making Russia an integral part of the international system is the main task of the current international order."

Currently, the following principles influencing the development of diplomacy are gaining strength: geopolitical confrontation, manifested in differences in approaches to conflicts between Western countries and Russia; use of force or threat of force, as well as a display of force; increased mistrust among major players; the emergence of new hotbeds of tension with elements of military conflicts; creation of "fake states" by terrorists and their becoming independent centres of influence; the emergence of goinformation competition in some regions of the world, including Central Asia. Recently, with the help of modern information technologies, some countries are trying to use international non-governmental organizations for their own interests. Such organizations have become an effective tool in promoting and protecting the interests of a number of countries. They are effectively using the internet and social media. Currently, there are about 50,000 websites, chats, forums, blog user groups, video-sharing sites, and social networks related to terrorist activities.

Modern science does not have the same view of the essence and main manifestations of this phenomenon. It is more about a set of changes that are taking place in both parallel and interrelated movements that are having a profound effect on the global economy and politics. The emergence and constant discussion of the concepts of new world order, "bipolar" and "multipolar world" in scientific and political circles indicate that it is impossible to form an opinion in advance about the modern system of international relations, especially after the collapse of the socialist camp.

I. Mavlanov, taking into account the above-mentioned points, the principles of integration, which are one of the components of the globalization

process observed in almost all regions of the world and emphasized by various theoretical schools; When talking about the methods and means of solving the problems that arise, almost all theoretical schools note that they place high hopes on diplomacy.

Therefore, due to changes in the system of international relations, the tasks of diplomacy in foreign policy are increasing. It is known that the state has additional tools and methods to fulfil its foreign policy tasks. For example, the ministries (departments) of foreign affairs and defence are instruments of state foreign policy. They have similar tasks in the field of foreign policy. The mission of the Foreign Ministry is to establish contacts with a view to resolving the problem through negotiations, while the mission of the Ministry of Defence is to resolve a foreign political issue through the use of weapons or the threat of using them. As can be seen clearly, the activities of these ministries differ according to the content of their tasks. But according to the form, the activities of both ministries consist of processes subject to certain, but mutually different rules. Diplomacy is the only (albeit extremely unique) peaceful instrument of state foreign policy. On the other hand, war is a particularly powerful tool of foreign policy.

"The foreign policy of the state is carried out within the framework of the international system that interacts with the foreign policy of other countries and their allies and is influenced by international organizations. The foreign policy behaviour of the state is related not only to internal factors, but also to the state of the international system, which, on the one hand, limits foreign policy, and on the other hand, allows certain foreign political actions."

Thus, the tasks of diplomatic activity aimed at fulfilling the foreign political tasks of the state by peaceful means are formed on the basis of certain strategic foreign political tasks and are directed to the realization of urgent national interests. At the same time, national interests are aligned with the processes taking place in the system of international relations.

When studying the historical experience and modern processes of Uzbek diplomacy, it is necessary to take into account the so-called "oriental diplomacy theory". Diplomatic relations did not develop only in the West, therefore, the principles of their development, the theory and the methodology of their implementation are not observed only in those countries. The diplomacy of Eastern countries has its own characteristics. Some countries that were isolated from the outside world (Japan, China) or under colonial conditions (India, some African countries) were forced to respond with cunning,

tyranny, and even aggression. For a long time, Eastern diplomacy had to work with a powerful adversary and proceed with extreme caution, with the end in mind, sometimes deliberately dragging out negotiations in order to extract more from the partner. At the same time, in the diplomacy of the Eastern countries, figuratively speaking, the “spirit of the Eastern market” is felt. Researchers suggest that this phrase does not have a general theoretical meaning, but rather serves to describe the behaviour of some diplomats and, of course, some countries that do not necessarily belong to the East. Although the modern diplomacy of the Eastern countries has its own characteristics, these characteristics are specific to each country and do not necessarily correspond to the above definition.

When speaking about the Central Asian region, the diplomacy of the states in this region had its own aspects and aspects. Here, as a rule, diplomatic etiquette (etiquette) and customs, differ from European traditions, some peculiarities of diplomatic behaviour aimed at the peaceful resolution of conflicts and concessions at any cost are visible. We can cite a vivid example from history that shows the subtleties of Eastern diplomacy.

A problem appeared during the preparations for the first meeting of the first Russian ambassador who visited Bukhara Emirate with the Emir of Bukhara. According to local tradition, the emir should have greeted the ambassador sitting on his throne, surrounded by courtiers, with a serious look. According to the diplomatic protocol adopted in Europe, the rule of greeting the standing ambassador with a smile followed. Bukhara and Russian diplomats thought a lot and finally found a way out of such a delicate situation. A Russian officer entered the Kabul palace with an open Koran in his hand. In this situation, of course, it was natural for Amir to stand before the Bible. The Amiri of Bukhara did the same. As a result, everyone was satisfied with the event.

### 3 CONCLUSION

At the same time, it is taken into account that the countries of Central Asia have never been the same ethnically, linguistically, and even religiously. In this area, many diplomatic tasks were solved through dynastic marriages, as well as by subtly managing the internal and external political interests of rivals.

Historical experience in international relations and current intense processes require states to frequently change their foreign policy strategies and directions

and adapt to the conditions. This situation, in turn, is the reason for the improvement of the methods and tools of diplomacy. Therefore, the above-mentioned situations require the study of modern diplomacy and the drawing of relevant conclusions based on this, and ultimately the development of proposals aimed at its improvement.

### REFERENCES

- Popov V.I. Modern diplomacy: theory and practice: Course of lectures. Part 1: Diplomacy - science and art / YES MFA of the Russian Federation. – M.: Scientific book, 2000. – P. 576 p.
- Diplomatic Dictionary / Rep. ed. A. A. Gromyko. T. 1. – M.: Nauka, 1984. – P. 327.
- Akhtamzyan A. A. Evolution of the basic concepts and terms of diplomacy // Russian diplomacy: history and modernity. – M.: ROSSPEN, 2001. – P. 387–397.
- Strezhneva M.V., Rudenkova D.E. European Union: architecture of foreign policy. – M.: IMEMO RAS, 2016. – P. 119.
- Cameralist (German cameralist, French cameralistique, Latin camera – treasury, organization) is a special cycle of administrative and economic sciences taught in European universities in the Middle Ages (XVI–XVIII). Chamberlistics got its name from the chamber organizations founded by medieval European princes, dukes and kings who were considered the owners of large farms. In the framework of chamber studies, managers of large zamindars were trained in universities and special chamber schools. //bse.sci-lib.com/article058245.html
- Nechaeva Yu. V. Origin of diplomacy // Diplomatic Bulletin of Transnistria. – 2011. – No. 6. – P. 45.
- Durdyeva A. A. Diplomatic structures and instruments of diplomacy of the European Union and member states: correlation and relationship. dis. ...cand. watered Sci. – M., 2017.
- Popov V.I. Modern diplomacy: theory and practice: Course of lectures. Part 1: Diplomacy - science and art / YES MFA of the Russian Federation. – M.: Scientific book, 2000. – P. 13.
- Selyaninov O.P. Notebooks on the diplomatic service of states. – M.: MGIMO, 1998. – P. 10.
- Kyrgyzboev M. Political science: a guide for students of higher educational institutions. - T.: New age generation, 2013. - p. 486.