



THE ROLE OF PEOPLE'S DIPLOMACY IN THE SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Majidov Sodiqjon Sadullayevich
Namangan Engineering – Construction Institute

ANNOTATION

The possibility of a quick and principled solution to the problem is the main reason for the intensive development of high-level and high-level diplomacy today, but there are other reasons. In particular, at such meetings, it is possible to quickly get the necessary information, exchange views and reach important agreements.

KEY WORDS: *people diplomacy, international relation, politics, meetings, information, development.*

DISCUSSION

The settlement of conflicts and crisis situations is one of the most urgent tasks of modern diplomacy. This was highlighted with particular sharpness by the Caribbean crisis of 1962, which threatened the destruction of all mankind. Finally, the next critical moment was the development of local conflicts after the end of the cold war, when many different conflicts proved difficult to manage. All this stimulated conceptual and practical developments, which in turn contributed to the identification of an independent field of research and diplomatic practice. We are talking about diplomacy to resolve conflicts and crises (manage them). However, in the scientific literature, "crisis management" is often described as a set of actions aimed at achieving the goals of the parties while preventing the conflict or crisis from getting out of control. In this regard, the Australian researcher J.R.Tolkien. Richardson suggests the use of another term - "crisis diplomacy", which implies activities aimed at reducing tension in the context of conflict and crisis. In recent years, more and more attention has been paid not just to reducing tension, but to preventing the development of conflict and crisis situations in the world. This is the so-called preventive diplomacy.

A new feature of modern diplomacy is, in particular, its diversity. If earlier the regulation of international relations by diplomatic means was actually reduced to issues of foreign policy and trade, then in the second half of the XX century the range of issues expanded dramatically. Such areas as disarmament, the environment, terrorism, social issues and many others, including the previously mentioned internal conflicts, have become the subject

of discussion and regulation. As a result, the content of the agenda, which can be the subject of diplomatic discussion, has become much more complicated, and the diplomats themselves have had to master new, previously unfamiliar areas. As a result, in the training of diplomatic personnel in the training programs, along with the traditional courses (regional studies, historical, legal, economic, language), completely new ones have appeared. For example, the Institute of Foreign Service (the leading center in the United States for the training of diplomatic personnel) has introduced courses on drug trafficking, refugees, environmental protection technologies, and possible expansion of markets for the United States.

The dynamism of the modern world, along with interdependence, has significantly changed the information and communication function of diplomacy, the essence of which is, on the one hand, to inform the opposite side about the official position, on the other-to receive similar information from it, as well as to exchange views.

The development of the means of communication in the XX century had a great impact on the information and communication function of diplomacy. Back in the 50s, Mr. Nicholson drew attention to this, noting that in the modern world, a foreign minister can pick up the phone and contact many ambassadors at once. The modern English researcher D. Dunn notes that the emergence of such means of technical communication as telephone, fax, e-mail, video communication and others, which were impossible in the past centuries, entails a significant intensification of interstate dialogue.



The possibility of rapid movement from different points of the globe also contributes to the rapid exchange of information at the interstate level. This is particularly important for high-level and high-level diplomacy. For example, trying to mediate in the conflict between Argentina and Great Britain over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), US Secretary of State A. Hague covered a distance of a total of 34 thousand miles in five days.

However, the main thing is not in the technical innovations, but in the very essence of the change in the information and communication function. At the dawn of its formation, diplomacy largely assumed cunning, participation in conspiracies, deception, etc. It was not for nothing that the god Hermes, a symbol of "enchantment, trickery and cunning", was chosen as the patron saint of diplomats. This aspect of diplomatic activity drew the attention of the English diplomat G. Wotton, who lived in the late XVI-early XVII centuries. His jocular phrase later became an aphorism: "An ambassador is an honest man who is sent abroad to lie for the good of his country."

Later, outright deception, bribery and similar means left the diplomatic practice, which, according to G. Nicholson, meant the maturity of diplomacy and radically distinguished the classical French school of diplomacy, which began to take shape in the XVII - XVIII centuries. and then spread around the world, from what preceded it-the Italian embassy missions of the XV century. Of course, these and other tricks have not disappeared from diplomacy at all, but such means of influence are rather what the American researcher J. R. R. Tolkien said. Der Derian called it antidiplomacy.

In modern diplomacy, the emphasis has become not just on the rejection of outright deception. Such deception, as R. Axelrod's research has shown, is simply unprofitable in conditions of interdependence and constant interaction (and modern international relations are characterized by a very high intensity of interaction in different aspects and using different channels), because it immediately causes a response, and also leads to discredit of the one who uses such means. Today, the informative and communicative function of diplomacy is primarily to establish a dialogue between different countries.

The ideas of dialogue, dialogic communication, developed at the time by the Russian literary critic M. M. Bakhtin, at the end of the XX century began to develop in relation to diplomacy. Diplomatic dialogue involves, first of all, the recognition of the fact that the other side has its own interests and goals. The recognition of this is not only natural and natural, but also a productive moment in the development of international relations. Therefore, the main thing in the communication and information function is not the directive imposition of one's own

point of view, but the search for a mutually acceptable solution through dialogue.

The ideas of developing interstate dialogue are also reflected in the theoretical works on negotiations, where the concept of hard bargaining, when each participant cares only about their own interests and presents their position as extremely closed, has been replaced by the concept of joint analysis of the problem with a partner. The latter implies a focus on mutual satisfaction of interests and a fairly open nature of negotiations. And although both concepts are almost never implemented in practice in a "pure form", yet the trend towards joint analysis of problems with a partner is beginning to prevail today. The prevalence of joint analysis of international problems in modern diplomacy also contributes to its development at a high and high level.

The next feature of the development of the world, which has radically influenced diplomacy, is the democratization of International relations and the active entry of non-state actors into the world arena. This factor has been in effect for almost a century. One of the first "troublemakers" was the 28th US President W. Wilson (1856-1924), who came up with the idea of democratic diplomacy focused on disarmament, free trade, liberalism, and openness to the public (the need to register treaties and ratify them). Ideas In. Wilson found a different response from political and public figures of the time: some enthusiastically supported them, others met with skepticism. The latter included, for example, Mr. Nicholson. He believed that in order for diplomacy to be truly effective, it should not be carried out in full view of everyone. Subsequently, this idea was rather figuratively formulated by the American authors W. Zartman and M. Berman. They noticed that if the negotiations were held in public, their participants would be more likely to be drawn to the windows than to each other. In other words, openness encourages the parties to take public actions rather than actually solve the problem. In this regard, we should rather demand openness of the final documents, but not the process of their development and discussion.

Nevertheless, in the second half of the twentieth century, diplomacy increasingly falls under the control of the public, both because of the great opportunities of the mass media, and because of the need to ratify many documents, and, finally, because various movements – ethnic, religious, etc., as well as public organizations and academic circles that have engaged in traditional diplomatic problems - the search for agreement in conflict situations, the provision of mediation services, etc. - have increasingly entered the international arena. Similar phenomena, of course, were known before. However, in the second half of the XX century, their activities became quite large-scale. As a result, in the late 70s



and early 80s, the "second direction of diplomacy" (Tsask Two Diplomacy) began to form, in contrast to its "first direction", i.e., official diplomacy. Representatives of the second direction are mainly researchers, journalists, retired diplomats. It has received the greatest development in the United States, although in recent years many European countries, in particular Sweden, have paid great attention to its development.

The activities in the "second line of diplomacy" are mainly focused on the settlement of conflict situations. One of the most active representatives of the "second direction of diplomacy" is the American author J.Montville defined it as "informal, informal interaction between members of hostile communities or nations, the purpose of which is to develop strategies, influence public opinion, and organize human and material resources that could contribute to the resolution of the conflict." He, based on the works of his predecessors, formulated the tasks of this direction, namely:

- the formation of working relations between representatives of the warring parties on a personal level;
- improving the adequacy of perception; forming ideas about the conflict from the point of view of the opposite side,
- development of conflict resolution strategies, but to a limited extent, only as possible solutions

Representatives of the "second line of diplomacy" emphasize that, unlike official diplomacy, coercive and directive measures, including sanctions or other means of exerting pressure, are excluded here. The main task is to create favorable conditions for improving mutual understanding between the parties and finding their own solutions in a particular situation.

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that the importance of diplomacy at the end of the XX century is undoubtedly increasing. This is primarily due to the fact that forceful solutions to international problems, despite their continued use, are becoming increasingly dangerous. In addition, the restructuring of international relations associated with the processes of globalization, the entry into the world arena of non-State actors, poses the task of diplomacy to actively engage in the creation of a new image of the world.

REFERENCES

1. Лебедева М. М. Политическое урегулирование конфликтов: подходы, решения, технологии. - М., 2005
2. Ergashev I., Farhodjonova N. Integration of national culture in the process of globalization //Journal of Critical Reviews. – 2020. – T. 7. – №. 2. – С. 477.
3. Qizi F. N. F. Modernization Of Uzbek Language And National-Spiritual Heritage In National Culture //The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations. – 2021. – T. 3. – №. 01. – С. 585-594.
4. Farhodjonova N. F. FORMATION OF NATIONAL IDEA THROUGH FACTORS OF NATIONAL CULTURE //МИРОВАЯ НАУКА 2020. ПРОБЛЕМЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ. – 2020. – С. 3-6.
5. Isroilovich I. M. et al. PHILOSOPHICAL IDEAS AND VIEWS OF NATIONAL CULTURE IN THE CONDITION OF GLOBALIZATION //PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology. – 2020. – T. 17. – №. 7. – С. 14289-14295.
6. Farhodjonova N. F., Abdurahimov V. A. MODERN TECHNOLOGIES OF STUDENTS TRAINING IN HIGHER EDUCATION //НАУКА И ТЕХНИКА. МИРОВЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ. – 2020. – С. 5-7.
7. Ergashev I. UZBEKISTAN'S NATIONAL IDEOLOGY IN THE CONTEXT OF DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT Ибодулла Эргашев //1000 kopii. – С. 18.
8. Farhodjonova N. F. RELATION TO NATIONAL CULTURE IN THE CONDITION SPIRITUAL RENEW OF SOCIETY IN THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN //Мировая наука. – 2018. – №. 6. – С. 14-17.
9. Numonjonov S. D. Innovative methods of professional training //ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 01 (81). – 2020. – С. 747-750.
10. Эргашев И. Сўёсат фалсафаси //Тошкент.: "Академия. – 2004.
11. Эргашев И. Политика государства независимого Узбекистана на селе: теория и практика. – 1995.
12. Farhodjonova N. F. FORMATION OF NATIONAL IDEA THROUGH FACTORS OF NATIONAL CULTURE //МИРОВАЯ НАУКА 2020. ПРОБЛЕМЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ. – 2020. – С. 3-6.
13. Ergashev I. CIVIL SOCIETY AND YOUTH //Science and Education. – 2021. – T. 2. – №. 2.