

UDC 323; 327

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2023.49.30>

POLITICS, DIPLOMACY AND GOVERNANCE OF GLOBAL HEALTH

Jafarova Lala Afig gizi

*National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan
Istiglaliyyat str., 30, AZ 1001, Baku, Azerbaijan
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9918-7677>*

The purpose of this study is to explore global health as a factor in politics and diplomacy. This article is mainly focused on the study of a new scientific direction – Global Health Diplomacy (GHD) and Governance – in terms of political science. The concept and definition of GHD as a scientific direction is considered. An attempt is made to analyze scientific research in this area based on the most popular scientific databases, such as JSTOR, etc. The article reflects data on the number of studies conducted in this direction in the context of political science and also highlights the importance of politics, practical application of diplomacy and governance during the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic.

Research method: The study represents a literature review based on popular scientific databases. The quantitative research approaches to synthesize scientific works on Politics and GHD as well as qualitative research approaches to synthesize qualitative-based works in the field of politics of global health was used.

Research novelty: The scientific novelty of the study lies in the attempt to analyze global health issues as an integral part of politics and diplomacy. Fundamental works, as well as the study of the scientific direction of GHD and global health governance in the context of political science, were not found in Azerbaijan scientific literature.

Conclusion: Based on the analysis, we can conclude that there is a lack of scientific work devoted to GHD in the context of political science. An analysis of popular scientific databases showed that the number of works is quite limited. Although this area is not so popular in the prism of political science, the coronavirus pandemic has shown that global health issues can have quite broad political implications, since decisions about government responses to a pandemic require political involvement and require cross-sectional studies.

Key words: politics, diplomacy, global health diplomacy, global health governance, global health politics, politics of global health, COVID-19, international relations.

Introduction. The purpose of this work is to study a relatively new direction – Global Health Diplomacy. This article covers the analysis of scientific databases related to political science covering this topic. Article also covers health-related issues as a political factor.

Research method: The study examined search results for global health diplomacy in various political science research databases and performed statistical analysis. While researching the topic different scientific methods have been used including analytical description, theory and statistical analysis.

Research novelty. The scientific novelty of the article is the study of different scientific databases on the topic of global health diplomacy in terms of political science. The study of this scientific direction in the political context has not been implemented in Azerbaijan political literature until now. Although different political issues have been studied in depth, health-related topics were not considered in the prism of politics and diplomacy.

Diplomacy is a crucial tool that helps to achieve results required by the state's political interests and foreign policy. States also use diplomatic tools to address complex challenges

the international community faces. Therefore, they establish connections and communicate with other nations at different levels to achieve common goals or fight against international concerns.

Public health management, particularly concerning infectious diseases, presents a formidable challenge for most nations. Health issues at the global level are inevitably intertwined with political implications. Scientific literature has identified specific fields that deal with transnational diseases, such as Global Health Politics/Policy, Global Health Diplomacy, and Global Health Governance. “Policy” and “politics” are terms often used interchangeably in the prism of global health. However, in the context of this study, we will focus on the concept of “politics” as we do not aim to detail the terminology.

Global health politics, diplomacy, and governance are the fields of study that emphasize the importance of addressing health issues within the broader geopolitical landscape. All these fields of study have become especially relevant against the background of the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, which showed that it is essential to approach such complex topics in an academic tone to ensure their rigorous analysis and critical evaluation.

Global Health Diplomacy: Global Health Diplomacy (GHD) is one of the modern scientific fields. It studies health issues, the solution of which requires and is possible only with the help of foreign policy participation. GHD developed into a new field of study long before the coronavirus pandemic, but the recent crisis has brought renewed focus to this field of study.

It is noteworthy that despite the political connotation of the concept, its consideration most often attracts scientists in the field of health and not political science. However, understanding the political aspects of the events on the world stage is vital. Ultimately, the country’s diplomacy is subject to the logic of national interests, which applies to any area, including health. Ruckert et al. [1, p. 61] described GHD as “the practices by which governments and non-state actors attempt to coordinate and orchestrate global policy solutions to improve global health.” Nevertheless, we believe that the authors’ approach from the point of view of politics is not entirely correct. Countries and politicians seek to improve global health, but only in the light of the political interests of the country they represent.

Authors also characterized GHD as an “emerging field of practice” [1]. Thus, as of June 24, 2023, the search on “global health diplomacy” returns the following number of results: ScienceDirect – 137 (58 were published from 2019 to 2023), JSTOR – 226 (37 were published from 2019 to 2023), PubMed – 150 (58 were published from 2019 to 2023), Bielefeld Academic Search Engine (BASE) – 613 (246 were published from 2019 to 2023), and so on. Indeed, a relatively small number of studies in this area confirm the direction’s novelty. However, these figures also demonstrate that this field of study began to develop even before the coronavirus pandemic, which did not become the primary impetus for a sharp increase in research in this area. Thus, a search for “global health diplomacy” in Google returns 185,000 results, of which only 41,200 are for 2020–2022. Nevertheless, the COVID-19 pandemic showed its importance and has given impetus to its broader study. Moreover, COVID-19 has also illustrated some practical examples of its application that deserve attention.

Definition of the Global Health Diplomacy: The inception of a novel domain often entails rigorous attempts at delineating its scope and nature. Peter Bourne, a special assistant to the US president for health issues, is credited with introducing the idea of “medical diplomacy” in 1978 [2]. Over time, the original meaning began to expand, which is also associated with the processes of globalization. Moreover, the scientific approach gradually moved beyond specific medicine and covered health care in general. Within the framework of this work, we do not aim to consider medical concepts in detail. However, we note that human health is determined by a wide range of determinants, such as economic well-being, the ecology of the place of residence, and others not associated with medicine.

The concept of “medical diplomacy” serves as the foundational premise of the developing field of GHD, demonstrating the potential for interdisciplinary collaboration between health and diplomacy. This type of diplomacy can be classified as “soft power” [3] as it can help build strong partnerships to ensure regional and global security. The “soft power” approach also can be applied to the GHD as, according to Lee et al. [4] it can help “to obtain an objective through persuasion and collaboration, rather than through economic influence or political domination.” However, despite its importance, Feldbaum and Michaud [5] conclude that health issues constitute “low politics” as they are “driven by Foreign Policy Interests,”; and the authors also describe it as “soft power.”

The modern concept of GHD is based on the approaches of WHO [34] (2023), which defines “health as a goal of foreign policy and as a key contributor to development, peace, poverty reduction, social justice and human rights.” According to WHO, health diplomacy can promote sustainable development by addressing health as a significant social and economic issue. It can assist countries in safeguarding their mutual interests and taking collective action on issues of shared concern, such as health security, health promotion, disease prevention, access to medicines and technologies, food security, and water.

It is not possible to describe all the concepts available on the Internet. However, we will generalize the concepts based on PubMed as the most prominent biomedical source and JSTOR, within which we will search only sources from the “political sciences” and “international relations” sections.

GHD in PubMed: Let us turn to the PubMed database to define the GHD concept. The first article on “Global Health Diplomacy” is dated 2007. In it, Drager and Fidler [6] define “foreign policy” to be “at the cutting edge” of GHD. However, other authors [7] believe that the GHD is “at the coal-face of global health governance – it is where the compromises are found and the agreements are reached, in multilateral venues, new alliances and in bilateral agreements.”

Most often, studies of GHD in the context of the medical sciences cover the distribution of vaccines [8]. Although “vaccine diplomacy” is an independent direction, it is not so widely covered. Thus, searching “vaccine diplomacy” in PubMed (as of June 25, 2023) reflects only 26 results.

Various authors present the definition of GHD, each with its focus. Thus, according to Kickbusch et al. [7], it “describes how governments, multilateral agents, and civil society organizations from different nations respond to relevant situations to population health and its determinants, which transcend national borders.” According to Guerra et al. [9], it is “a space of confluence, negotiation, and debate between countries with different power levels to influence decisions to improve or sustain global health.” Despite the two different definitions, they both cover the evaluation of different aspects related to health issues. Only if in the first case the authors focus on understanding “how,” then in the second definition – on the scope (“space”).

GHD in JSTOR: As we noted earlier, the total number of sources for the GHD query in this system is 226. However, we narrowed the search to the political science and international relations categories since they comprise only 66 out of 226 total results.

In this scientific database, the first source dates back to 2009. However, the article [10], as such, is not devoted to GHD and only mentions it indirectly. Sources from subsequent years cover issues such as HIV/AIDS Care [11], avian influenza [12], etc., many of which also do not refer to a comprehensive analysis of the concept, but rather situations under which it can be applied.

The work of Davies [13] considers various approaches to understanding “international politics of health,” in particular, based on security, established on the logic of foreign and defense political objectives, and “globalist,” based on the idea of ensuring the well-being and rights of

people. One of the author's works [14] also analyzed the relationship between issues of political stability and public health in conflict situations. Another study by Davies et al. [15] considers global health issues as "that advances key ideas and debates in international relations." That is, although the works are shown in the search for "global," they, in fact, study aspects of health within IR or the influence of political factors on the health of the population.

There are also works that consider GHD through the prism of the policy of implementing programs to combat tuberculosis and malaria [16], in promoting the right to health [17], in terms of political benefits of health assistance [18], and its role in advancing the Sustainable Development Goals [19].

GHD in other scientific databases: Access to various scientific databases can provide a strong foundation for analyzing sources and research trends in a particular field. For example, Google Scholar does not allow search by field of science, providing general results by topic. So, to consider additional information about which field of science a particular source belongs to, it is necessary to access the journal itself. Moreover, the most commonly referenced works can also be found in other databases. However, the database has the potential to be more comprehensive.

As of June 28, 2023, searching for "global health diplomacy" in Google Scholar returns 4,680 results. The first page of the search result (10 sources) yields the following results: 6 sources – journals in the field of medicine and health, 1 – social sciences, 1 – multidisciplinary journal in the field of public health and global well-being, 1 – multidisciplinary journal in the field of health and health policy, and one source is guidance from the Global Health Center of the Graduate Institute Geneva. Therefore, despite the large number of sources in this database, most of them also refer to publications in non-political science journals.

Search for "global health diplomacy" in the BASE (Bielefeld Academic Search Engine) within the "political science and International relations" subject as of 28 June 2023 returns 11 results; within "Foreign policy" – 11 results; within "Sociology and Political science" – 5 results, and so on. At the same time, the search within the "medicine" subject returns 41 results, "global health" – 26, "health policy" – 24, and so on. A search in this database also confirms the clear numerical superiority of non-political subjects.

A detailed consideration of all databases in the framework of this work was not the goal. However, even based on the information presented, it can be concluded that there is a general trend. GHD being an interdisciplinary field, more often attracts the attention of scientists in medicine, although its very name determines the necessity of consideration of political factors.

The Role of Diplomacy in Addressing Complex Challenges of Global Health: The international community constantly faces various challenges. One such urgent challenge is addressing the issues associated with overcoming the spread of infectious diseases and ensuring access to quality public health services. Thus, it can foster sharing of information and resources and enhance cooperation among countries during emergencies.

The solution to global issues of a medical nature requires direct political agreement. Therefore, there are many reasons to use diplomacy to address global threats. It concerns building cooperation and ensuring joint work on developing vaccines and their distribution, such as diagnostic tests, medicines, etc.

Information sharing between counties also can only be implemented in the presence of political agreements. It primarily concerns the issues of detection of outbreaks of diseases and monitoring their spread.

GHD in practice: Some examples from COVID-19: GHD focuses on global diplomatic discussions, including the completion of agreements between multiple or bilateral aid providers and recipient nations. It also involves establishing enforceable or non-binding international

accords related to health or closely related subjects. Managing health security threats like infectious disease outbreaks or pandemics also requires GHD. Countries collaborate by sharing information, coordinating responses, and developing strategies to prevent the spread of diseases across borders. Therefore, establishing mechanisms for collaboration between nations is a critical component of GHD. The study by Katsuma [20] showed the importance of diplomacy as an essential tool for addressing global health issues, which led to the expansion of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the development of universal health insurance (UHC) arrangements. The author points out that infectious diseases have become perceived as a security threat in GHD, and Japan is actively using the concept of “human security” to “elevate the level of dialogues,” in the context of which the country’s diplomacy was activated against the background of the G20 Summit to promote UHC.

Within the framework of the GHD implementation, it is crucial to develop and ensure the coordinated work of countries to implement specific measures. As a rule, WHO acts as the central coordinator that presents general recommendations or guidelines, which are subsequently implemented at the level of individual countries. The WHO has released guidelines on public health measures such as social distancing and handwashing, assisting in exchanging information and resources between countries.

Carrying out mass vaccination is a vivid example of implementing WHO recommendations in practice. Since it was used in almost all countries, it can be said that certain coordination of actions was ensured by political decisions within the states that guaranteed coordination of actions, e.g., the Coronavirus Act 2020 ensured related measures in the UK. Thus, according to Ritchie et al. [21], “70.3% of the world population has received at least one dose of a COVID-19 vaccine.” So, mass immunization was also ensured due to the coordinated work of local (state-level) and international [34] (WHO-level) parties.

There are various ways and measures of implementing the GHD. First of all, it is negotiations and advocacy. Thus, a study of food marketing in India [36] showed the importance of the negotiation process for both nation-states and non-state actors. The study concludes that success in GHD should not be measured solely by the endorsement of international recommendations but also by their implementation at the national level, as only nation-states are ultimately responsible and able to implement them.

The negotiation process is the basis for implementing international relations between countries and is used while working on agreements. Also, countries can bring their position – agreement or disagreement – on specific document points through negotiations. That also applies to health issues. Thus, one of the practical applications of the GHD is the adoption of the International Health Regulations (IHR). Other examples of global health diplomacy in action include the international response to major health crises such as COVID-19, Tuberculosis, the adoption of the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC), etc.

In the realm of cooperation, GHD is an essential component in the collaborative efforts of countries to enhance healthcare infrastructure, improve health systems, and combat health disparities in low-income countries. Such efforts involve fostering partnerships, extending financial aid, and sharing knowledge to attain better health outcomes on a global scale. Thus, the Global Fund to Combat AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria represents an international financial mechanism – a partnership that invested more than US\$55.4 billion over 20 years [22]. The successful work of such funds exemplifies the potential of diplomacy to collect resources and provide assistance in confronting significant global health concerns.

GHD has significantly contributed to the progress of COVID-19 vaccines, treatments, and diagnostics through international collaboration. This collaboration has hastened the development

of these crucial resources and improved their accessibility on a global scale. The Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) is a prominent example of such collaboration, as it provides substantial funding for the research and development of vaccines targeting emerging infectious diseases, including COVID-19. CEPI's investment in COVID-19 vaccines exceeds \$1,5 billion [23].

Diplomacy in public-private partnerships (PPPs) facilitates dialogue, coordination, trust-building, negotiation, and advocacy among stakeholders to implement PPP projects in healthcare and overcome potential challenges effectively. One of the examples of PPP is the COVAX (the vaccines pillar of the Access to COVID-19 Tools Accelerator), which became a "super public private partnership for global health" amid COVID-19 [24]. The primary objective of COVAX, established in 2020, is to ensure that vaccines are available to all nations, irrespective of their income level.

Delivering assistance by high-income countries within the framework of GHD can take the form of providing medical supplies to countries worldwide, including masks, gloves, gowns, ventilators, and testing kits. During the coronavirus pandemic, high-income countries like the US and China used GHD tools the most [25]. The EU also has been actively coordinating the procurement of medical supplies globally. It should be noted that coordinated work was also observed within the EU itself. Thus, to ensure a coordinated approach on the issue of freedom of movement and COVID-19-related restrictions, the EU Digital Covid Certificate [26] has been introduced.

The complexity of diplomacy is that the participants involved in the process must be able to look for ways to realize political interests based on the country's priorities. In this case, it is necessary to note the role of ambassadors, attachés, and other officials. However, in today's environment, non-officials, such as individual corporation representatives, can also participate in the negotiation process or lobby for particular interests. Therefore, GHD balances health concerns with trade interests, negotiating agreements on issues like food safety and pharmaceutical patents. Thus, dealing with issues related to international trade and health issues also involves balancing the various interests of the countries of the world and private corporations. The World Trade Organization (WTO) plays a regulatory role in this context. Thus, against the background of the pandemic, the issue of patent rights for the production of vaccines against coronavirus was one of the topics of political discussions [27]. As a result of numerous negotiations, a waiver to the TRIPS Agreement that allows countries to make compulsory licenses for pharmaceutical products to address public health emergencies was secured.

Role of Politics in Global Health Governance: Global health governance (GHG) is a relatively young field since it began to be actively studied in the scientific literature in the 90s of the last century. According to Kickbusch and Liu [28], against the background of COVID-19, GHG has become "integral to geopolitics." The authors indicate that diplomacy is a constructive part of the system of GHG and argue that a more central role of international relations concepts and theories in analyzing GHD would help develop a more nuanced understanding of global health policymaking.

Diplomacy and governance in the context of global health are interrelated and based on political factors. Thus, countries may be reluctant to cooperate on global health initiatives if they see no benefits. On the contrary, high-income countries can influence global health decisions, regardless of alignment with other nations, while limited economic resources hinder investment in global health programs.

The GHG concept definitions are different, but to one degree or another, they cover the need to address health-related issues [29; 30]. The most cited definition of GHG was proposed by Weiss and Thakur [31], who described it as "The complex of formal and informal institutions,

mechanisms, relationships, and processes between and among states, markets, citizens, and organizations, both intergovernmental and non-governmental, through which collective interests on the global plane are articulated, rights and obligations are established, and differences are mediated.” Thus, a search for that definition in Google Scholar as of June 29, 2023, produces 15,800 results.

Another often-cited definition was proposed by Fidler [32], who described GHG as “the use of formal and informal institutions, rules, and processes by states, intergovernmental organizations, and nonstate actors to deal with challenges to health that require cross-border collective action to address effectively.” Thus, as of June 26, 2023, Google Scholar provides links to 29 works when searching for this definition. However, some works also use its partial formulation, e.g., Damiani et al. [33] define GHG “as the use of institutions, rules and processes to deal with challenges to health that require cross-border collective action to be addressed effectively.”

Global health governance is a complex and ever-evolving field. The need for effective global health governance will only grow as the world becomes increasingly interconnected. Thus, Youde [34] believes that the GHG differs from earlier “modes of cross-border health cooperation,” in that it has established that different actors play a significant role in the global health agenda. Those actors are represented not only by states but also by international and private philanthropic organizations and civil society groups. Therefore, the author considers the GHG a “highly chaotic system.” Moreover, the political climate can have a significant impact on GHG. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the “diplomatic stand-off between the USA and China” [28] blocked many agreements.

Conclusion. In a recent paper, Fidler [36] called for developing a US foreign policy in the field of global health, as this area poses a potential threat to national security interests and economic power. The author points out that the US failed “to protect vital national interests, develop public and global health capabilities, and maintain domestic and global solidarity against health threats.” Therefore, developing a new strategy in foreign policy on global health for the U.S. is required. It should be mentioned that Fidler is a Senior Fellow for Global Health and Cybersecurity, which indicates the multifactorial nature of issues related to global health. However, we believe they are centered on politics and political decisions made by political leaders. We agree with Fidler on the need to assess the political impact of global health issues. Since threats in this area can cross the borders of countries and even continents, all countries require a political strategy to respond to such situations.

Diplomacy and politics play a leading role in matters of global health, providing the emergence of new scientific directions such as GHD and GHG. The analysis of various databases confirms that GHD is a relatively new area, poorly researched in political science. Various studies have argued for the importance of political factors but mainly studied within the medical and health sciences. Nevertheless, global health issues attract the attention of scientists in international relations (IR) and global governance.

The study of GHD shows that this is a sufficiently capacious and interdisciplinary area. However, in our opinion, it has not been studied enough regarding its political significance, the number of works is small, and the topics are somewhat limited. Therefore, there is an urgent need for political scientists to study this field in more detail.

References

1. Ruckert, A., Labonté, R., Lencucha, R., et al. (2016). Global health diplomacy: A critical review of the literature. *Social Science & Medicine* 155: 61–72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.03.004>.

2. Katz, R., Kornblat, S., Arnold, G., et al. (2011). Defining Health Diplomacy: Changing Demands in the Era of Globalization. *Milbank Quarterly* 89(3): 503–523. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0009.2011.00637.x>.
3. Marrogi, A., Al-Dulaimi, S. (2014). *Medical Diplomacy in Achieving U.S. Global Strategic Objectives*. Available at: https://ndupress.ndu.edu/Portals/68/Documents/jfq/jfq-74/jfq-74_124-130_Marrogi-al-Dulaimi.pdf (accessed 25 June 2023).
4. Lee, K., Chagas, L.C., Novotny, T.E. (2010). Brazil and the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control: Global Health Diplomacy as Soft Power. *PLoS Medicine* 7(4): e1000232. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000232>.
5. Feldbaum, H., Michaud, J. (2010). Health Diplomacy and the Enduring Relevance of Foreign Policy Interests. *PLoS Medicine* Lee K (ed.) 7(4): e1000226. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000226>.
6. Drager, N., Fidler, D. (2007). Foreign policy, trade and health: at the cutting edge of global health diplomacy. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 85(3): 162–162. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2471/blt.07.041079>.
7. Kickbusch, I., Silberschmidt, G., Buss, P. (2007). Global health diplomacy: the need for new perspectives, strategic approaches and skills in global health. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 85(3): 230–232. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2471/blt.06.039222>.
8. Fidler, D.P. (2010). *The Challenges of Global Health Governance*. Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/resrep24171.pdf> (accessed 29 June 2023).
9. Guerra, G., Orozco, E., Jiménez, P., et al. (2021). Global health diplomacy in Mexico: insights from key actors in the field. *Globalization and Health* 17(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-021-00789-y>.
10. Stevenson, M.A., Cooper, A.F. (2009). Overcoming Constraints of State Sovereignty: global health governance in Asia. *Third World Quarterly* 30(7): 1379–1394. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590903152686>. (accessed 25 June 2023).
11. DeLaunay, S., Fournier, C. (2010). How to Keep Promises: A Way Forward for Optimizing HIV/AIDS Care. *Harvard International Review* 32(2): 12–15. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42763366> (accessed 25 June 2023).
12. Curley, M.G., Herington, J. (2010). The securitisation of avian influenza: international discourses and domestic politics in Asia. *Review of International Studies* 37(1): 141–166. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210510000537>.
13. Davies, S.E. (2010). What contribution can International Relations make to the evolving global health agenda? *International Affairs* 86(5): 1167–1190. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2010.00934.x>.
14. Davies, S.E. (2014). Healthy populations, political stability, and regime type: Southeast Asia as a case study. *Review of International Studies* 40(5): 859–876. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210514000321>.
15. Davies, S.E., Elbe, S., Howell, A., et al. (2014). Global Health in International Relations: Editors' Introduction. *Review of International Studies* 40(5): 825–834. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210514000308>.
16. Kevany, S., Jaf, P., Workneh, N.G., et al. (2014). Global health diplomacy in Iraq: International relations outcomes of multilateral tuberculosis programmes. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival* 30(2): 91–109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13623699.2014.890827>.
17. Šehović, A.B. (2019). Health diplomacy: For whom? By whom? For what? *Regions & Cohesion / Regiones y Cohesión / Régions et Cohésion* 9(1): 161–176. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26890730> (accessed 25 June 2023).
18. McInnes, C., Rushton, S. (2014). Health for health's sake, winning for God's sake: US Global Health Diplomacy and smart power in Iraq and Afghanistan. *Review of International*

- Studies* 40(5): 835–857. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24564391> (accessed 25 June 2023).
19. Buzaladze, G., Defor, A. (2019). The role of Global Health Diplomacy in advancing the Sustainable Development Goals. *International Journal* 74(3): 463–471. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26831366> (accessed 25 June 2023).
 20. Katsuma, Y. (2023). Global Health Diplomacy to Combat Communicable Diseases and to Promote Universal Health Coverage in Achieving the Sustainable Development Goal 3. In: Urata S, Kuroda K, and Tonegawa Y (eds) *Sustainable Development Disciplines for Humanity: Breaking down the 5Ps—People, Planet, Prosperity, Peace, and Partnerships*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, pp. 17–35. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/9789811948596_2.
 22. The Global Fund (2022). About the Global Fund. Available at: <https://www.theglobalfund.org/en/about-the-global-fund/> (accessed 28 June 2023).
 21. Ritchie, H., Ortiz-Ospina, E., Beltekian, D., et al. (2020). Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). *Our World in Data*. Available at: <https://ourworldindata.org/covid-vaccinations#citation> (accessed 29 June 2023).
 23. Rogers, J. (2022). Q+A: How CEPI-funded research is supporting the COVID-19 vaccine rollout. Available at: https://cepi.net/news_cepi/qa-how-cepi-funded-research-is-supporting-the-covid-19-vaccine-rollout/ (accessed 29 June 2023).
 24. Storeng, K.T., de Bengy Puyvallée, A., Stein, F. (2021). COVAX and the rise of the ‘super public private partnership’ for global health. *Global Public Health*: 1–17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2021.1987502>. (accessed 25 June 2023).
 25. Sandberg, K., Pickard, K., Zwirblis, Jr Jay, et al. (2022). Health Diplomacy: A Powerful Tool in Great Power Competition. Available at: <https://ndupress.ndu.edu/JFQ/Joint-Force-Quarterly-107/Article/Article/3197223/health-diplomacy-a-powerful-tool-in-great-power-competition/> (accessed 29 June 2023).
 26. Gstrein, O.J. (2021). The EU Digital COVID Certificate: A Preliminary Data Protection Impact Assessment. *European Journal of Risk Regulation* 12(2): 370–381. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/err.2021.29>.
 27. Jakupec, V., Kelly, M., de Percy, M. (2022). *COVID-19 and Foreign Aid: Nationalism and Global Development in a New World Order*. Taylor & Francis.
 28. Kickbusch, I., Liu, A. (2022). Global health diplomacy—reconstructing power and governance. *The Lancet* 399(10341). DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(22\)00583-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(22)00583-9).
 29. Lee, K., Kamradt-Scott, A. (2014). The multiple meanings of global health governance: a call for conceptual clarity. *Globalization and Health* 10(1): 28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1744-8603-10-28>.
 30. de Campos, T.C. (2020). Guiding Principles of Global Health Governance in Times of Pandemics: Solidarity, Subsidiarity, and Stewardship in COVID-19. *The American Journal of Bioethics* 20(7): 212–214. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2020.1779862>.
 31. Thakur, R., Weiss, T.G. (2006). *The UN and Global Governance: An Idea and Its Prospects*. Indiana University Press.
 32. Fidler, D.P. (2010). Negotiating Equitable Access to Influenza Vaccines: Global Health Diplomacy and the Controversies Surrounding Avian Influenza H5N1 and Pandemic Influenza H1N1. *PLoS Medicine* Lee K (ed.) 7(5): e1000247. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000247>.
 33. Damiani, G., Pettinicchio, V., Markovic, R., et al. (2019). Strategies and measurement for global health governance assessment: a 5-years mixed review. *European Journal of Public Health* 29(Supplement_4). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckz186.110>.
 34. WHO (2023). Global health needs global health diplomacy. World Health Organization. Available at: <https://www.emro.who.int/health-topics/health-diplomacy/about-health-diplomacy.html> (accessed 25 June 2023).

35. Youde, J. (2012). *Global Health Governance*. Polity.
36. Fidler, D.P. (2023). *A New U.S. Foreign Policy for Global Health COVID-19 and Climate Change Demand a Different Approach*. CFR. June. Council on Foreign Relations Press. Available at: <https://www.cfr.org/report/new-us-foreign-policy-global-health> (accessed 29 June 2023).
37. Smith, R., Irwin, R. (2016). Measuring success in global health diplomacy: lessons from marketing food to children in India. *Globalization and Health* 12(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-016-0169-5>. (accessed 25 June 2023).

ПОЛІТИКА, ДИПЛОМАТІЯ ТА УПРАВЛІННЯ ГЛОБАЛЬНОЮ ОХОРОНОЮ ЗДОРОВ'Я

Джафарова Лала Афіг гизи

*Національна Академія Наук Азербайджану
вул. Істиглаліят, 30, AZ 1001, м. Баку, Азербайджан
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9918-7677>*

Метою цього дослідження є дослідження глобального здоров'я як чинника політики та дипломатії. Ця стаття в основному присвячена вивченню нового наукового напрямку – Global Health Diplomacy (GHD) and Governance – з точки зору політології. Розглянуто поняття та визначення ГХД як наукового напрямку. Здійснено спробу проаналізувати наукові дослідження в цій галузі на основі найбільш популярних наукових баз даних, таких як JSTOR та ін. У статті відображено дані про кількість проведених досліджень у цьому напрямі в контексті політології, а також висвітлено важливість політики, практичне застосування дипломатії та управління під час пандемії коронавірусу (COVID-19).

Метод дослідження: дослідження являє собою огляд літератури на основі науково-популярних баз даних. Використовувалися кількісні дослідницькі підходи для синтезу наукових робіт з політики та GHD, а також якісні дослідницькі підходи для синтезу якісних робіт у сфері політики глобального здоров'я.

Новизна дослідження: Наукова новизна дослідження полягає в спробі проаналізувати глобальні проблеми охорони здоров'я як невід'ємну частину політики та дипломатії. В азербайджанській науковій літературі не знайдено фундаментальних праць, а також дослідження наукового напрямку GHD і глобального управління охороною здоров'я в контексті політології.

Висновки: На основі проведеного аналізу можна зробити висновок про брак наукових робіт, присвячених GHD у контексті політології. Аналіз науково-популярних баз даних показав, що кількість праць досить обмежена. Хоча ця сфера не є такою популярною з погляду політології, пандемія коронавірусу показала, що глобальні проблеми охорони здоров'я можуть мати досить широкі політичні наслідки, оскільки рішення щодо відповіді уряду на пандемію вимагають політичної участі та міжсекторальних досліджень.

Ключові слова: політика, дипломатія, глобальна дипломатія охорони здоров'я, глобальне управління охороною здоров'я, глобальна політика охорони здоров'я, політика глобального здоров'я, COVID-19, міжнародні відносини.