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Abstract

The diplomatic agents, serving abroad, fulfill important responsibilities by representing the political interests of their own governments and fellow citizens in the host state. The whole work, performed by diplomatic agents abroad, is being performed without the direct protection of their sending state. In modern conditions the problem of physical, also informational, technical and other kinds of security of diplomatic missions is no less relevant, than in the past, especially, that the problem concerns all states. The present article is devoted to the elaboration on the pertinent topic of international protection of the diplomatic agent during his service in the host country.
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“We live in a violent age. Ambassadors, other diplomats and their physical premises have become significant targets for terrorists and for various disaffected groups…. Such incidents come in waves and no region is exempt.” [1] The attacks on ambassadors and diplomatic personnel, in general, is not a new phenomenon. Acts of violence against envoys had already taken place in the ancient period. With regard to modern times, diplomatic agents became targets for murder and kidnap particularly in the 1960s and early 1970s, and the extent of the obligation to protect them from attacks became highly topical. [2] (Sabanin counted only seven cases of murder of diplomatic representatives during the nineteenth era until the first decades of the twentieth century.) [3] The sovereign’s duty is to ensure public safety, and a diplomatic agent gets a higher level of protection in the receiving state, than a foreign person. Similarly to warfare, when the bearers of flags of truce were considered as sacred persons, during the times of peace, ambassadors, charged with friendly national intercourse, are objects of special respect and protection, each according to the rights that belong to their rank and station. At the same time, diplomats, generally, had been always the favored target of criminals and in modern times become the preferred target of terrorists. Transnational terrorism [4] has emerged as a common challenge to states, including all great powers. [5] Therefore, under international law, every government has to take all reasonable precautions to prevent the performing of unlawful acts. However, Reisman points out that states, facing criminal activity in our time – including terrorism and other forms of purposive political violence, acting alone, seem less and less be able to accomplish what is expected of it without locking itself into increasingly complex and durable intergovernmental arrangements. [6]
Even with the high level of contemporary scientific development, the problem of protection of diplomats has not been fully resolved yet. Diplomatic representatives are still in danger, performing their functions and the growing wave of terrorism worldwide generated tasks in ensuring their protection. Increased protection is also needed to be provided to diplomatic information – the special category of data. Consequently, in modern diplomacy, there has to be ensured the protection of diplomatic agents, at physical, psychological, technical and informational level. It may be required to treat the information – whether on hard copy or in electronic form, with certain safety measures. Diplomats have to be also very cautious with automobiles, which park in the vicinity of diplomatic premises and diplomatic residences, due to a number of cases, when motor vehicles, stuffed with explosives were used during terrorist attacks, since extremist operations have become increasingly common in today. There were many different terrorist organizations and groups, whose activities were often directed against diplomatic missions: kidnapping of diplomatic personnel, murder, armed attacks on diplomatic premises, seizure of buildings or their explosion have become quite frequent.

International law addresses the matter of protection of diplomats and certain conventions had been created in this regard. The atrocious attacks on diplomatic posts all over the world in history that are increasing in number, often accompanied with the murder of diplomatic personnel, are striking examples of the threats and dangers, diplomats have to face in their daily work. The offenders has not been traced and punished in all of these cases. Official authorities concerned, in large number of such outrages failed to take proper action to prevent criminal assaults on the person, freedom and dignity of diplomatic agents or to take measures in order to punish the criminals. These attacks illustrate that states breach their international legal obligation to protect the diplomatic premises and their diplomatic personnel, enshrined in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961. [7] In addition, The Vienna Convention does not determine the “all appropriate” measures [8] to be taken by the host state, to ensure the protection of diplomats [9] of the sending state. [10] Kurbalija agrees that the Convention is vague with in regard to specification of the “appropriate steps”, concerning in protection of diplomats, who were kidnapped or attacked, therefore the relevant provisions may require a reinterpretation of what is appropriate protection in modern times. [11] Furthermore, Minnaar points out that the “protection”, implied by the Vienna Convention, referred more to the provision of safety and security in times of civil unrest, [12] also armed insurrection and mob violence or rioting. [13] Hence at the time, when the Vienna Convention was signed in 1961, the high level of crime was not such the issue, as it became in the 1990s, so the extension of this protection would also include the situations of terrorist attacks [14] on diplomatic missions and kidnapping or hostage-taking of foreign diplomats. Moreover, the international responsibility for protection of diplomatic officials “remains the host state’s duty and its guilt, rather than innocence”, [15] is assumed every time, when at attack occurs on embassy staff.

With adoption of the diplomatic convention in 1961, the responsibility is on the host country to protect diplomatic officials both in times of peace and war. Therefore, ensuring the security of persons, who enjoy diplomatic immunity in accordance with international law, rests primarily on the state of their stay (the receiving state). Many states have adopted special related
laws, for example, in Russia, provisions, with respect to protection of foreign representatives, are part of the actual Criminal Code, under “Crimes against peace and security of mankind”. Nonetheless, the states often violate the integrity of these persons themselves.

Personal inviolability of the diplomatic agent (and his family) assumes increased responsibility of the host state for the security of this matter. In line for to the high occurrence of political acts of violence against diplomatic agents, along with using them as an instrument of chantage, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, which came into life as a response to the number of attacks on diplomatic agents during the sixties of the last century. The Convention emphasizes that the persons concerned are entitled to special protection, and that the sending state shall be responsible for the behavior of persons, enjoying diplomatic immunity. It should also be noted that in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, such offenses as murder, kidnapping, attack on the official premises, private accommodation or means of transport of the diplomatic agent, the threat of any such attack, as well as attempts to such attacks or acts as an accomplice in any such attack shall be considered as a crime. The contracted parties undertake to make these crimes punishable by “appropriate penalties which take into account their grave nature” and extradite the offenders or to apply the domestic law. States have to cooperate in the prevention of crimes, taking all practicable measures, coordinating the undertaken steps, exchanging information, related to the person of the alleged offender and the circumstances of the crime. In addition, the state, in whose territory the person, who committed a crime against a protected person is present, has to either extradict or prosecute him, in accordance with its laws. The Convention does not specify the term period of the punishment, though. The adoption of the Convention demonstrates that diplomatic law is not a static branch of public international law, it is dynamically developing, and has to address further questions that arise with time, such as protection of life of diplomatic agents. Authors note that judging by the increasing number of violent acts against diplomatic agents, this shows that the Convention proved to be ineffective so far, primarily due to the fact that many countries have not joined it yet, consequently they are not bind by the provisions of the Convention.

The increased protection of diplomats involves the following measures:
- to increase the sanctions in domestic legislation against persons, who encroach on the security of foreign representatives, enjoying special protection under international law;
- to establish a system that would ensure the inevitability of punishment for criminal acts, in accordance with international conventions;
- to harmonize the legislation in the field of criminal law that would eliminate “certain advantages”, in terms of the consequences of a criminal acts, provided for in various countries.

The protection of diplomatic personnel in the host countries is mostly afforded by measures, carried out by local (municipal) police, such as police post standing, uniformed presence, moving patrols, marked police vehicles. The request of special protection, mostly granted only on a reciprocal basis, although some missions assume that such service is granted automatically,
when requested. The degree of special protection of diplomats is determined by the level of threat or risk to the specific diplomatic mission, as assessed by the receiving state and could be provided in the following forms:

- Permanent posts: a) police officer, placed in front of a specific building, with possible support, provided by a second police officer, usually on a 24-hour basis, [27] b) guards, placed within the diplomatic mission’s building (or waiting areas). In both cases there could be installed direct communication lines or emergency buttons.

- Mobile posts: in forms of patrol cars, motorcycle patrols, foot or street patrols, including regular visits by police officers to embassies and official residencies, along with inspections of the exterior of these buildings and their surroundings.

- Backup for permanent and mobile posts: additional police vehicles can support the permanent and mobile posts, including special reaction mobile units, in necessary cases. [28]

The majority of the above-listed measures are instituted by host governments [29] primarily to deter terrorist or political acts against diplomats, rather than to protect foreign missions from an ongoing criminal activity. [30]

Embassies are also targets of terrorist attacks, also for violent protests and group incursions by asylum seekers. “Embassies are symbolically charged buildings uniquely defined by domestic politics, foreign affairs, and a complex set of representational requirements.” [31] Cases of capture of embassy buildings and hostage taking of peoples, found there have become a quite common phenomenon, as well as attacks on embassies, invasion of diplomatic missions, murder of ambassadors and members of the diplomatic staff. [32] Embassies are no longer considered the territory of the foreign state that occupies them, despite the articles of the popular press reports.

From the time when embassies became targets for terror, it affected the architecture of embassy buildings, and the new security standards turned these constructions into the modern equivalent of frontier stockades. [33] In a number of capitals, ambassadors, representing countries that face acute threat, are escorted by policemen and diplomatic protection group personnel, providing “portal to portal cervices”. Chanceries and residences of ambassadors are also protected by heavily armed personnel in many countries. Every diplomatic mission has adopted procedures for handling the threats that ambassadors and other members of Diplomatic Corps receive via telephone, mail and other means, including protection by private security agencies. Is increasing the number of sending states that deploy their own home-based armed security guards to protect ambassadors and embassies, almost always with the support of the receiving state. The architecture of diplomatic premises and access routes for the buildings have to take into account this threat environment. The major powers are able to afford spending vast sums on upgrading the physical security of such structures, installing blast-proof doors and walls, toughening the windows, constructing strong barriers at entry points, also providing the diplomats with bullet-proof vehicles. The smaller countries that have more modest financial means, consider that the general precautions they implement, along with their relative anonymity are the best protection. Diplomatic training programs in most of countries encompass security procedures. Security specialists are often on deputation form the home police or security forces at large embassies, to jointly with the deputy chief of mission take care of the ambassador’s personal security. The
envoys could become accidentally involved in a crisis situation, as it happened in December 1996, during the seizure of the Japanese Embassy in Lima by local extremists in the course of a national day reception. At the same time, Rana warns that security precautions, effected beyond a certain limit, usually become a burden and give diminishing returns in terms of actual safety. The safekeeping measures, enforced too strongly, prevent envoys from wide outreach and normal day-to-day activity, which is also part of the inevitable change and adaptation in our violent times. [34]

In general, the principle of reciprocity is applied in determination of the levels and forms of diplomatic protection, provided to foreign missions. There are countries, which provide protection for foreign missions, as part of their regular policing activities. Minnaar, elaborating on protection of host countries, provided to diplomatic representations abroad, brings South African missions, as an example, particularly, that their diplomatic personnel had also been victims of armed attacks (Mexico), burglaries (Zambia), muggings (Kenya) and car thefts (Hungary). In this way, diplomatic residences in Italy are served by the regular vehicle and foot police patrols in the neighborhood of embassies. In the Czech Republic, each suburb of Prague has a special police “protection unit”, engaged in investigation of problems that embassies report to the police. In Indonesia the special protection unit regularly patrols areas of official residences or where it is not feasible, the task is performed by the local police. The diplomatic missions in Slovak Republic are protected by the Department for the Protection of foreign Missions of the Ministry of Home Affairs, where there is an officer on duty 24 hours, to deal with the incoming calls and emergencies. [35] The protection of foreign missions in the United States [36] is provided, upon request, by the Office of Foreign Missions at the State Department. Such requested protection is provided in Washington only, by the U. S. Secret Service Uniform Branch Division and the U. S. Diplomatic Security Service. Both of the organizations provide help in case of security threats, such as manslaughter, kidnapping, hostage-taking, etc. The foreign missions outside Washington are protected, if requested by the local police that is normally the municipal police. In the United Kingdom, the Protocol Department of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office governs the protection of foreign missions, according to the U. K. Diplomatic Privileges and Immunities Memorandum. The level of protection depends on its accession by the Security Section of the Protocol Department, Diplomatic Protection Group of the Metropolitan Police and the Special Branch. The threat and risk assessment of foreign missions in Canada is carried out by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police that provides the protection of embassies and diplomatic residences by performed by police officers on a 24-hour basis. Furthermore, the special neighborhood watch system for diplomats and emergency numbers extend the protection of diplomatic personnel. [37]

In Great Britain, there was decided by The Foreign and Commonwealth Office at the early 2000s to significantly increase the capital budget for new embassy buildings and to replace ones that were assessed as insecure and for additional defenses at those Posts, where some weaknesses were identified. The decision was taken after the bomb explosion on 20 November, 2003 at Pera House in Istanbul, where Roger Short, the Consul-general, his assistant and eight local staff lost their lives. (This was the most deadly assault on a British mission since the Boxer siege in Peking, in 1900.) [38]
At peacetime, an embassy does not require permanent monitoring, performed by the host state, to secure the safety of premises. The extremist activities in the world are immediate reaction to the rising internal conflicts in a society. [39] There are diplomatic missions of certain countries, for example, the United States, The United Kingdom, Turkey and Israel, which are often a target to terrorist attacks, therefore need increased protection. In 2001-2007, the United States lost five ambassadors on duty, through acts of terrorism and assassination. [40] Turkey is another nation that has gravely suffered from radicals, for example at the hands of Kurdish separatists, then at the end of 2003, because of terrorists, linked with Al Qaeda. [41]

In August 2009, Molotov cocktails were thrown by unknowns at the Slovak Embassy in Budapest. According to the Police Department of Budapest, the lighter bottles, did not ignited, so there was no damage to the embassy building. The President, the Prime Minister and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Hungary condemned the attack, which further complicated the resolution of the existing disputes between the two states. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic regarded this incident an individual delict. [42]

There are cases of revolutions, when governments basically lose control over the situation, as it happened during the Arab Spring, when the involved Arabic countries were unable to protect their own citizens, not mentioning of foreign diplomats. It occurred that there was no special legislation to punish the lawbreakers during these stormy events. The Vienna convention did not regulate the situations when diplomatic agents fall victims of crimes, only prescribes that the diplomats have to be treated inviolably and host states bear the responsibility to protect them. U.S. Ambassador to Libya J. Christopher Stevens was among four Americans killed in an attack by Muslim protesters on the U.S. consulate compound in Benghazi. Diplomats, intelligence agents and the military missed obvious warning signs that could have enabled them to prevent the deadly attack on the U.S. diplomatic mission in Benghazi, say senators. A bi-partisan report for the first time points the finger at Ambassador Chris Stevens, who was killed in the attack, for refusing offers to reinstate soldiers at the mission in the weeks before the raid. It also criticizes the military for failing to respond more quickly on the night of the attack on September 11, 2012. [43]

The crime wave in Venezuela has reached embassies, as well. On 8 April, 2012, Guillermo Cholele, a Costa Rican attaché, was kidnapped in Caracas for ransom. In January Mexico’s ambassador and his wife were kidnapped. In general, about a dozen cases have been reported publicly in the past two years. There is no clear evidence that foreign diplomats are being specifically targeted, but at the same time, the diplomatic status did not offered much protection from Venezuela’s crime wave. And in fact, s close to 50 per 100,000 people, among the world’s highest. The government deployed hundreds of policemen to rescue Cholele, and he was released relatively unharmed in a day. Still, generally, most foreign officials have found Venezuela’s security services substandard. The embassies are given three phone numbers to use in an emergency. When the Mexicans called these emergency lines, after the abduction of their ambassador, but nobody answered the call. The government of Venezuela has even set up a diplomatic protection squad, but it started to operate only with a third of the staff it needs. Some diplomats said that their countries would reject such services anyway, for
fear that Venezuelan guards would act as spies, or worse. Thus, the authorities had to apply more measures to fulfill its obligations under the Vienna Convention, to protect foreign diplomats. [44]

On 5 March, 2015, Mark Lippert, the U. S. Ambassador to South Korea was stabbed during an event, organized by the Korean Council for Reconciliation and Cooperation, which advocates for peaceful reunification between North and South Korea. The Ambassador was slashed in the face, also suffered five cuts in his left arm and hand, shortly before he was supposed to give a speech. The attack was performed by Kim Ki-Jong, who was convicted afterwards of attempt of murder, assaulting the foreign envoy, also business obstruction and sentenced to 12 years in prison by the Seoul Central District Court. [45] Ki-Jong has had a history of unpredictable behavior already. In 2010, he received a suspended two-year prison sentence for throwing a piece of concrete at the Japanese Ambassador to South Korea. [46]

In October 2015, there was an artillery attack on the Russian Embassy in Damascus, which was apparently made by the insurgents. Protesters, loyal to the regime of the Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, gathered in the vicinity of the Embassy at that time, to express their gratitude to Russia for interventions of military forces, in support of Assad. No one was hurt at the Russian Embassy, according to the news. Sergei Lavrov, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, condemned the attack and said it was obviously a terrorist act. [47]

On 8 November, 2015, the Head of Press and the driver of the Serbian Embassy in Libya were kidnapped on their way to Tunisia. The Serbian Ambassador and his family traveled in one of the cars of the three-vehicle diplomatic convoy, and he survived the armed attack unscathed. The two kidnapped Embassy employees were probably killed during the air raid by the United States in February, 2016, on the supposed terrorist training center of the Islamic State, discovered in Sabratha. [48]

On 6 March, 2016, Ukrainian demonstrators were throwing eggs at the Russian Embassy, in Kiev, breaking several windows of the building, demanding the release of the pilot Nadiya Savchenko, detained in Russia, for her complicity in the murder of two Russian journalists. Several hundred people marched to the Russian Embassy, where they burnt Russian flags. Two demonstrators climbed over the fence of the Embassy and installed the Ukrainian flag on its wall. [49]

Special protection in case of diplomatic agents means more reliable protection, than that which states are obliged to grant to private persons. The protection, provided by the receiving state extends to the perimeter of a diplomatic mission, consequently, guards or police personnel could not patrol or be placed inside the premises or buildings of diplomatic missions. [50] To combat terrorism, special extra safety measures are required. However, the counterterrorism policy of the European Union after the events of September 9, 2011 in the United States, was criticized for being “ineffective, slow and incoherent”, as well as for “disproportionate, self-serving and partly illegal measures that undermine democratic and judicial oversight as well as civil liberties”. [51] In addition, because of the threat of radicalism today, an increased cooperation of intelligence services is required. In a number of terrorist attacks, clearly foreigners are the targeted persons. [52] Especially in some of the terrorist attacks on foreign targets. [53] However, the activity of intelligence agencies violates the sovereignty of states.
The increased terrorist activity in many countries, in particular the recent frequent cases of seizure of embassies by terrorists, the kidnapping and murder of diplomats (together with embassy staff and family members), have led to the introduction of internal security in a number of diplomatic missions. Receiving states normally allow the organization of internal security at diplomatic missions. The guards of internal security are usually carry with firearms, and in some countries are provided with heavy weapons. There were cases, when the internal security guards used their weapons in the attacks on diplomatic missions. The longstanding privilege of diplomatic missions to organize their internal life in accordance with the traditions and customs of their home country permits also the establishment of internal security at embassies, however, its status, along with the question of gun ownership, is not yet completely regulated by international law. The activity of the internal security has to be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Vienna Convention, connected, solely to the internal affairs of the embassy, without performance of any activity, above that scope, which could be considered as interference into the internal affairs of the receiving state. In such cases it should be remembered, though that under the Convention, the "special duty" to ensure the safety of foreign diplomatic missions lies on the authorities of the host country. The privilege of diplomatic missions to organize their internal life has, thereto its boundaries.

Embassies, if affordable, hire private security guards, [54] install additional emergency telephone lines to be connected to police stations. Subsequently, the protection of diplomatic personnel and embassy premises in our days can not be called consistent and sufficient in every state and under all circumstances. Certain countries, for instance Angola and Egypt established special protection units or diplomatic guards. Nonetheless, in practice, the "diplomatic police" is mainly used for surveillance purposes and not specifically for the protection of diplomats or assurance of the security of diplomatic missions, as for example, in case of Saudi Arabia. The actual protection of diplomats is habitually provided on request by military guards and not the police. In addition, some countries provide special telephone lines, linking embassies directly to local police stations, for instance, Malaysia, where they are called "hot-lines". Certain authorities, as in Seoul, use the "police-box" system at official residences and chanceries that contains a register to be signed by police officers during routine patrols. In Hong Kong, an emergency button is installed in the office of the head of diplomatic mission, to alert the Hong Kong Police VIP Protection Unit. In Japan such emergency button system also encompasses the residence of the head of mission. In Moscow and Saint Petersburg, the protection of foreign missions is carried out, upon request, by the Independent Battalion or Patrol Service on a 24-hour basis, who work in 12-hour shifts and monitored by patrol cars every four or six hours. In Beijing, police boxes are installed on most of the streets and every embassy has a fulltime guard, working in shifts, at the entrance to the embassy compound. [55] The protection of diplomatic personnel lacks in some countries, such as Nigeria. In Lagos armed gangs view diplomatic staff as targets for money, robbing their homes, shooting at diplomatic vehicles, bribing embassies for telephone lines or allowance of other services. Therefore, most embassies in Nigeria hire private security guards and install expensive alarm systems. [56]

It should be stressed here that the level of protection of diplomatic service
in general, should be adequate to the already existing and also the new threats of information technology (IT), mathematical software, technical and certainly, physical character. [57] In this way, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation pays special attention to the problem if information-psychological security [58] of the diplomatic service, as well – protection of diplomatic servants from negative external information-psychological influence. [59] (The information-psychological concerns today are both a civilian and a military matter.) [60] The professionalism of diplomatic agents in the sphere of information technologies protects him from hasty decisions and steps. Diplomatic information is a special kind of data, [61] and depending on its source, types and level of reliability, it is able to cardinally change the relations between states. [62]

In spite of all the existing legislation on the protection of diplomatic agents, diplomats are still being kidnapped or taken hostages by radical groups to force state authorities to agree with their conditions, therefore the life of contemporary envoys is still unsafe. Due to the increasing frequency of assaults on diplomatic personnel, it should be specified what are the exact “appropriate steps” to be taken by the host state, referred to in the Vienna Convention with respect to the protection of diplomats. The present provisions on the status of diplomatic agents, enshrined in the Vienna Convention, have to be revised and improved, in the light of the fact that states, being interrelated, try to boost their global presence and influence in the world, increasing the number of state servants abroad, as well. Since the adoption of the Convention, there have been many serious changes, related to diplomatic scope of activity, not covered by this treaty. The existing lacunas in jurisdiction bring new challenges for diplomatic practice and sometimes lead to problems. Scholars believe that the question the full protection of diplomatic agents in the territory of the host state, as well during his transit through the territory of other states countries is not enough developed in contemporary international law, neither by science of international law, nor by domestic legislations. Therefore, further development of these matters would be necessary, along with improvement of the already existing legislation and codification of new norms on the protection of diplomats. In a sum, owing to the fact that the comprehensive protection of diplomatic staff and missions abroad is still inadequate and unreliable, the measures to grant security of diplomatic personnel should be increased.
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