

obshcheobrazovatelnoy shkoly i problemy podgotovki pedagogicheskix kadrov: Sb. nauch. tr. APN USSR NII general pedagogy. - M., 1978. - p. 24-36.

19. Prixojan, A.M. Prichiny, prophylaxis and overcoming anxiety. // Psixologicheskaya nauka i profilaktika.- 1998.- №2.- S.11-17.

20. Stolyarenko L.D. Basics of psychology. - R / naD .: Phoenix, 1997. - p. 736.

21. B.M.Prakticheskoe myshlenie: chrestomatiya po obshchey psixologii myshleniya. - M .: Pedagogika, 1981. - C. 177.

22. Trevoga i trevojnost / V.M.Astapov. - SPb .: Peter, 2001.- 156p.

23. Goziev EG "Psychology of higher education" Tashkent Publisher 2010

Abrar Turaev, Senior Lecturer, Department of Social Sciences, Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

INTERPRETATION OF NATIONAL INTERESTS AND PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW IN THE IDEOLOGY OF NEOCONSERVATISM

A. Turaev

Abstract: The article discusses the approaches of the US ideology of neoconservatism to national interests, the attitude of neoconservative theorists to international relations and world politics, the neoconservative interpretation of the harmony of foreign policy and national interests, and the conflict with international law.

Keywords: neoconservatism, foreign policy, international relations, national interest, international law, political ideology, USA, security

In the current era of globalization, the democratization of society and governance and the building of civil society are becoming increasingly important. Modern ideological processes affect all spheres of social life and reflect the nature of the domestic and foreign policies of states that are on the path of development, their attitude to international legal norms. It is well known that today the norms of international law take precedence over the national legal approaches of states, and this system is considered a reliable factor in the stability of world politics and international relations. At the same time, domestic and foreign policy, formed under the influence of modern political ideologies, sometimes contradicts the norms of international law. In particular, the radical ideas and hegemonic approaches of the neoconservatism ideology formed in the United States do not conform much to the rules of international institutions.

For liberals, international law, international organizations, and universal morality have played a key role in defending U.S. national interests, while for conservatives, the first priority for the U.S. has been to balance the forces of its close allies in the international arena and protect American business. U.S. conservative foreign policy traditions have emphasized a lack of confidence in multilateral international institutions and the predominance of unilateral actions by the United States and its allies. Adherence to tradition has led to increased focus on military capabilities and increased defense spending. Such features of American conservatism can also be seen in today's foreign policy strategies.

One of the peculiarities of the ideology of U.S. neoconservatism is reflected in the attitudes of neoconservative theorists to issues of international relations and world politics. The foreign policy ideology of neoconservatism sees international relations as a highly conflicted, anarchic environment, and recognizes the decisive role of the power factor. According to neoconservatives, humanity will always exist in the "anarchic world of T.Hobbes", where international legal norms are ineffective, the promotion of security and liberal order depends on the existing military force and readiness to use it.

In international relations where anarchy reigns, the power of a particular state is a more important factor for neoconservatives. R.Kagan emphasizes that this rule has been relevant since the time of the Roman Empire and is still so today Despite the possible abuse, military force remains a universal tool for solving problems[1].

According to the neoconservative approach, international law and institutions are ineffective tools and can also play a negative role in advancing national interests. Allied states are perceived by neoconservatives as a situation where interests are matched. But still their reliability is questionable, the main means of restraining them is military force. Another characteristic feature of neoconservatism is its rigid approach to evaluating a state's foreign policy by its political system. Autocracies, authoritarian regimes are more aggressive subjects of international relations, and at the domestic political level they are not bound by certain restrictions. Democracies, on the other hand, are more peace-loving. J. Kirpatrick also emphasizes that there is a need for US power for the survival of liberal democracy[2, p.3-16].

Based on historical experience, neoconservatism is close to realist approaches as the main source of theoretical and empirical conclusions about security strategy and foreign policy. Like political realism, neoconservatism sees the nation-state as the main subject.

In contrast, neoconservatism denies the "balance of power" and "de-ideology of national interests", which are important concepts of realism. The

factor that brings us closer to the liberal paradigm is the strategy of spreading democracy. But the difference is in the use of military force. For neoconservatism, moral correctness is important, not factual truth.

Unlike realists who base the system of stability and relations in international relations on a "balance of power," neoconservatives seek to articulate this issue through the ideology of "America's Choice" and the universality of American socio-political principles. That is, instead of trying to strike a balance against the U.S., a weak state should instead seek to unite with it. But this proposal only applies to democratic systems.

An analysis of the problem shows that the neoconservative idea of "intervention for freedom" is somewhat subtle, and the idealistic conception of the right does not deny the use of elements of realism. In the structure of national interests, neoconservatives combined and combined realistic elements (power, intervention) with idealistic elements (character of political systems, values, ideas, loyalty to historical traditions, freedom). This unification limits the recognition of neoconservatives such as W. Kristol and R. Kagan as representatives of the school of realists. Idealistic elements undoubtedly take precedence in their interpretation of national interests. Pursuing an idealistic policy leads to the application of double standards. In particular, the United States has sometimes turned a blind eye to violations of democratic values and human rights when it is in its best interests. Moreover, the mere inculcation of democratic ideas into the world by force is itself incompatible with democratic principles.

It is known that the interests of society, in turn, are inextricably linked with the national interest. Foreign policy goals are inextricably linked to domestic politics, cultural values, and public behavior. Proponents of neoconservatism argue that a healthy society is willing to pursue an effective foreign policy, unable to survive a social order based on selfish principles. The stronger the person-centeredness in a society, the weaker and more vital the resilience of the society. Selfishness erodes the possibilities of collective protection, leading to foreign policy indifference. It has a healing effect only if foreign policy goals are widely accepted in society[3, p.321].

That is, through such conclusions, the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of liberal ideas are criticized.

Another distinctive feature of neoconservatism is that neoconservatives have always been skeptical of international institutions. In particular, neoconservative views on the work of the UN have been formed.

Kirkpatrick, who served as U.S. ambassador to the UN from 1981-1985, acknowledged that the UN has become an opportunity to polarize its members instead of collectively resolving existing problems. That is, it is a place to vote and be encouraged to choose a particular party. Even if the

voting state sees no personal interest in the situation of a particular issue under discussion, it is forced to side with someone.

J.Bolton, the US permanent representative to the UN from 2005-2006, criticized the UN, listing a number of shortcomings. For example, the UN only becomes active during major international crises, such as the Gulf War[4].

However, there are shortcomings in the veto power of permanent members of the UN Security Council. In particular, not all of them are democracies.

Neoconservatives have been strongly opposed to entering into a number of arms deals. This ranges from nuclear test ban treaties to medium- and short-range missile limitation treaties. In general, neoconservatives believe that U.S. security, in turn, relies on the U.S. military, not on the mirage of arms control.

That is, in the anarchic context of international relations, it makes no sense to reduce or limit U.S. military power. In turn, U.S. neoconservatives support military cooperation, particularly military blocs led by him. In this regard, Churchill's view that "sometimes, in cooperation with the Allies, they also have personal views" and similar approaches are in full harmony with the views of neoconservatism. According to neoconservatives, NATO has the ability to perform many UN functions. With the end of the Cold War, it became a central element of a community of nations that united common political values[5]. In their view, this military bloc is a guarantor of world order.

In short, the domestic and foreign policy of the United States, based on the ideology of neoconservatism, is in constant conflict with international law. International principles, recognized by the world community as the most important factor of stability in the era of globalization, are being rejected by neoconservative approaches. This, in turn, increases the likelihood of further escalation of conflicts in world politics. The violation of international norms on the basis of the priority of national interests and their practical expression in the activities of major powers sometimes calls into question the effectiveness of the international legal system. Therefore, the formation of a specific global ideological immunity, which weakens the governing capacity of ideologies that represent different radical ideas, is becoming an important task.

References:

- 1.Kagan R. Why America Must Lead // The Catalyst. – 2016. – No.1.// www.bushcenter.org/catalyst/leadership/why-america-must-lead
- 2.Kirkpatrick J. The Reagan Phenomenon – and Other Speeches on Foreign Policy. – Washington D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1983. – P.3–16.

3. Williams M.C. What is the National Interest? The Neoconservative Challenge in IR Theory // European Journal of International Relations. – 2005. – Vol. 11. – No.3. – P. 321.

4. Bolton J.R. The UN Crisis Is About More Than Money // Los Angeles Times, 13.04.1997. // http://articles.latimes.com/1997-04-13/opinion/op-48352_1_legitimacy-crisis

5. Schmitt G., Memorandum to: Opinion Leaders, Subject: NATO enlargement. What is the «Threat?» // Project for the New American Century, 13.10.1997. // <http://www.newamericancentury.org/nato-19971013.htm>

6. Turaev, A. (2019). Islamic factor in neoconservative foreign policy of the USA in the Middle East. Theoretical & Applied Science, (2), 175-178.

7. Turaev Abrar Salokhiddinovich, Abdusamadov Farrukh. (2020). The Impact of Changes in Public Administration on the Development of Neoconservative Ideas in the United States. International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology, 29(3), 8104 - 8114.

Abrar Turaev, Senior Lecturer, Department of Social Sciences, Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

THE IDEOLOGY OF NEOCONSERVATISM IN THE CLASSIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Abrar Turaev

Abstract: This article describes the role of the US ideology of neoconservatism in the system of international relations, approaches to national interests, the methodological basis of modern neoconservative theories.

Keywords: U.S. neoconservatism, ideology, international relations, national interests, security

U.S. neoconservatism incorporates elements of classical paradigms - political realism and liberalism - in the theory of international relations. Neoconservatism is a unique subjective reality in international relations and world politics that defines the long-term and priority goals of the United States in this area. In the foreign policy views of neoconservatives, the process is characterized by a binary, two-way assessment (good-bad, positive-negative), which is clearly reflected in foreign policy practice.