



Prospects for the Development of Local Wars in the International Arena

Sapaev Jasurbek Kamilovich¹, Uralov Xusan Boboqulovich²

¹ *National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Head of the scientific department of the military training center, major in the reserve*

² *National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Senior teacher of the cycle of chemical protection and topogeodetic supply of the Military Training Center of the Engineer-Sapyar troops, associate professor, lieutenant colonel in the reserve*

Abstract: *This article examines the trends and prospects for the development of local wars in the international arena. Modern local wars are characterized by the tendency of their internationalization, which is due to the fact that the goals of the belligerents somehow affect the interests of third countries that are involved in the conflict in one form or another.*

Keywords: *local wars, armed conflicts, USA, Russia, NATO, Nagorno-Karabakh, Ukraine.*

How quickly the situation on the world scale is changing today, the situation in some regions of the world is becoming more and more acute, various contradictions, conflicts and bloodshed are intensifying, the danger of international terrorism, extremism and cross-border crimes is increasing, and the ongoing military conflicts in our immediate vicinity are deeply felt by us. does not fail to arouse a feeling of concern and anxiety".

The Armed Forces are the basis of the state military organization and the country's defense system, designed to contain and prevent military conflicts, as well as to ensure the military security of the state [1].

The 21st century has dramatically changed world politics on a global scale, and this has been reflected in the activation of geopolitical, geoeconomic, military-strategic activities of major actors and entities.

Due to the growing role of China, India, and Russia, the sole hegemony of the United States in the world political order has ended.

The rapid development of the economy of China, Japan, India, South Korea, and Taiwan caused the center of power to shift to the Asia-Pacific region.

The negative aspect of the transformation is evident in the growing confrontation between the United States and Russia [2].

Wars have always accompanied human progress. Only "in the last 5.5 thousand years, more than 14.5 thousand big and small wars took place in the world, in which more than 3.6 billion people died from hunger and epidemics "[8; p. 69 pages].

Whether local or international in nature, wars have always had devastating consequences for cities, countries, and local populations.

The goals of war in different eras were different: "if in ancient times wars were fought primarily for the benefit of the ruling classes and had the goal of capturing slaves, in the Middle Ages wars were aimed at seizing land and people. Increasing the income of the top of society. Industrial capitalism During the period, major countries rapidly expanded their possessions and markets through military intervention and changed the political and economic map of the world in their own way" [8; page 70].

Already in the twentieth century, wars were fought to divide the world. Thus, the First World War was aimed at redistributing the world and spheres of influence. After the First World War, the world began to be drawn into new military conflicts, the scope and consequences of which were much greater than the previous ones. In this case, we are talking about the Second World War and the Great Patriotic War.

The initiator of the Second World War was the Nazi leadership of Germany, which was later joined by the fascist regimes of Italy, Japan and other countries. These regimes sought to forcibly subjugate other countries and all of humanity and thereby establish world domination.

Thus, the Nazis waged an aggressive war, whose goals were "anti-democratic, inhuman in design and content, barbaric in their achievement" [8; page 70].

Since the end of the Second World War, there have been no such major wars on earth. However, local wars or regional military conflicts occasionally break out in one or another part of the planet, involving many participating countries.

Due to the frequent occurrence of local wars in the scientific community, interest in issues related to local wars has increased. Therefore, it is necessary to dwell on this issue in more detail.

K. Clausewitz understood local war as "a form of conflict limited in time, space, and scale, aimed at exhausting the enemy and aiming at victory." [6; p.177 page].

According to Clausewitz, "small wars, for example, are fought on the borders of states. The disruptive actions characteristic of small wars serve to demonstrate power and force the enemy to accept the terms of the winning side without a general battle. Clausewitz also refers to the concept of small wars to various popular partisan spectacles also included wars based on "[11; p. 134 pages].

The military encyclopedia defines a local war as "in contrast to a world war, the spatial scale of military operations, the number of participants, and the forces and means used are limited" [4; p. 378 pages].

Local wars aggravate the international situation, intensify military and political conflicts and increase the possibility of a new world war. The local wars started by the developed countries of the West in recent years not only reflect the confrontation of individual countries, but also aim to end globalization by military means and establish a unipolar world.

Modern local wars are distinguished by their interstate character, which means that in addition to two combatants, other states with their own interests also participate in them. The existing system of international treaties and agreements allows the parties to the conflict to receive various types of assistance from allied countries. As a result, a local war takes on the characteristics of a coalition war, which in turn can lead to an expansion of its scope.

Modern domestic wars are "large-scale forces participating in armed struggle, up to operational and strategic groups of both sides; the use of various methods and forms of warfare on a tactical and strategic scale; the use of all available arsenal of means of armed struggle - from the most modern weapons and military equipment, in particular , light weapons to precision weapons. Some countries violate international legal norms during local wars, use means and methods of war prohibited by international law against civilians and prisoners of war. Thus, the UN considers the actions of the United States of America in Vietnam as genocide, Israel in the occupied Arab territories, South Africa in Namibia" [5; p. 55 pages].

Modern local wars, as a rule, begin with a sudden attack on important infrastructure and economic facilities. It is enough to remember how local wars started in Yugoslavia, Libya, Iraq, Syria and other countries. Nevertheless, in recent decades, the initiators of such local wars have not been able to win any of these wars. The exception here is probably the war in Yugoslavia. "The struggle against foreign invaders, along with other means of resistance, was provided by moral and political forces based on the just nature of the war with the aggressors, including the awareness of the defensive nature of the struggle of the nations under attack. This stopped the "civilizers" in Vietnam and North Korea Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria" slowed down the aggression [5; p. 56 pages].

There have been many local wars in the past decade. It is enough to recall the wars in Iraq, Libya, the ongoing war in Syria, military conflicts in Ukraine and Nagorno-Karabakh, etc.

The crisis in Ukraine had a significant impact on the state of the entire international system. This conflict also affected the relationship between Russia and NATO. This relationship has never been easy. However, in 2011-2013, that is, before the start of the "color revolution" in Ukraine, relations between Russia and NATO were more or less stable. In turn, the Ukraine crisis had a negative impact on the relationship between Russia and NATO. As a result, NATO declared Russia the main threat to international stability and accused it of seeking to "redraw" Europe's borders. Russia does not like NATO's expansion to the East, as well as attempts to destabilize the situation in Russia's neighboring countries.

The most objective evidence of the current state of relations between Russia and NATO is concrete actions and decisions taken by both sides. Thus, in 2016, a new concept of Russian foreign policy was adopted, according to which "Russia is very worried about the eastward expansion of NATO and the strengthening of the alliance's activities near the borders of Russia, which leads to the emergence of danger. " [5].

The concept also states that "NATO, together with the European Union, is carrying out geopolitical expansion, putting pressure on Russia in all directions, which is extremely harmful to regional and global security. NATO and the European Union demonstrate their unwillingness to take real measures to create an effective and fair security system in Europe" [3].

It can be seen that "the concept clearly implies the destructive role of NATO and the EU in recent years. It is noted that the policy of the West to contain the Russian Federation has a negative impact on regional and global security, which has a particularly negative meaning in the era of cross-border challenges and threats, which, by definition, must be solved jointly need., and not to form new dividing lines, but, like NATO" [12; p. 44 pages].

Now let's see how NATO's attitude towards Russia has changed due to the situation in Ukraine.

Thus, according to the results of the Newport summit, three main decisions of NATO were made:

- 1) To recognize Russia's aggression against Ukraine. To suspend practical cooperation with Russia, to "freeze" relations with it. At the same time, to maintain political channels of interaction with Russia regarding the situation in Ukraine;
- 2) End the reduction of defense budgets of NATO member countries, raising them to the level of 2% of GDP. In addition, at least 20 percent of the countries' military expenditures must be spent on the purchase of new weapons;
- 3) An increase in the number of rapid reaction forces (RDF) of NATO.

Creating a joint high readiness force of 20,000 people in Siberia" [13]. At the Polish NATO summit held in Warsaw in 2016, the following decisions of NATO were noted:

- 1) deployment of four NATO battalions in Poland, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia to protect these countries from potential Russian aggression;
- 2) the simultaneous strategy of "restraint and dialogue" with Moscow;
- 3) strengthening the presence of NATO in the Black Sea region" [13].

The 2017 NATO Summit in Brussels summarized the following outcomes:

- 1) NATO's entry into the international coalition to fight ISIS;
- 2) increasing the defense costs of NATO member countries" [13].

The NATO summit held in Brussels in 2018 was marked by the following results:

- 1) Approval of the obligation of NATO members to raise military expenditures to the level of 2% of GDP. It is planned to achieve this indicator by the end of 2024.;
- 2) creating additional battalions, forming new squadrons and increasing the NATO fleet;
- 3) establishment of new command centers: Atlantic Command (Norfolk, USA) and Logistics Command (Ulm, Germany);
- 4) NATO members again condemned Russia's policy and stated that its "aggressive actions" pose a serious threat to the security of the alliance members [13].

It is also necessary to note the main events directly related to the USA as the head of NATO. The launch of the European Confidence Building Initiative in 2014 and the adoption of the new US National Security Strategy in 2017 should be given the greatest attention.

The European Confidence Building Initiative is an American project for additional NATO funding aimed at modernizing and strengthening the Alliance's infrastructure and increasing the number of NATO forces in Europe. As a result, the project was aimed at strengthening Europe, and "the United States will be responsible for their territorial integrity and sovereignty. In fact, this meant a US operation involving Russia " [13].

Thus, the United States attaches great importance to this initiative, which is evidenced by the significant increase in project funding over the past two years. At the same time, the main focus is on the creation of reserves of military equipment, which indicates the desire of NATO to prepare the rear in case of a possible war with Russia.

In addition, NATO annually conducts up to 40 large-scale operational training events "in Europe with a clear focus against Russia. For example, in the spring of 2021, NATO began the large-scale exercise "Defender of Europe 2021". Now American troops are being transferred from the continental part of North America to Europe across the Atlantic Ocean. . In Europe, there is a movement of troops to the borders of Russia. The main forces are concentrated in the Black Sea region and the Baltic region" [13].

Coordination centers were established in Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria to ensure the assembly of NATO troops and supplies. Weapons, military and special equipment reach Greek ports.

Another important document is the National Security Strategy of the United States 2017. In the strategy, "Russia and China threaten the interests of the United States and seek to undermine America's influence in the world. Thus, the United States actually recognizes the desire for global domination, a unipolar world. Americans want to dominate the world with no one do not want to share, and therefore the growing influence of Russia and China worries them very much" [12; p. 46].

In addition, the strategy states that Russia is actively moving in the direction of Europe in order to distance Europe from the United States and to split into NATO. At the same time, Russia is accused of directly invading Georgia and Ukraine. In addition, Russia has been shown to violate the sovereignty of many countries around the world by interfering in their internal politics.

This shows that relations between Russia and NATO are at a very low level, in fact they have returned to the Cold War era. Both sides see each other as their main rivals on the international stage. In the United States and NATO countries in Europe, the myth of the threat from Russia is deliberately created and developed, and in the Baltic countries and Poland, the military forces of the alliance are being built.

On the issue of relations between Russia and NATO, the positions of Western and Russian researchers are completely opposite. A large number of Western experts consider Russia to be the main threat to international stability and security and consider it to be guilty of violating international law. In turn, most Russian researchers believe that Russia is simply protecting its national interests and is not ready to be ruled by the United States, which is trying with all its might to undermine Russia's position in Europe and the world, to deprive it of its traditional sphere.

The recent instigation of the war in Nagorno-Karabakh is another attempt to draw Russia into the field of international military action, so NATO will try to destroy the population of the Russian Federation under the pretext of a retaliatory strike. The main trends of military operations in Nagorno-Karabakh in 2020 can be identified:

preparations for war were carried out openly. Joint Azerbaijan-Turkey military exercises were held one after the other in the territory of Azerbaijan with the scenario of "liberation of the territories occupied by Armenians." It seems that such activities were not appropriate in the context of the escalation of the situation on the borders of Russia in different directions (Belarus crisis, coup in Kyrgyzstan)" [9];

"Pashinyan apparently maintained relations with the Azerbaijani President Ilhom Aliyev and mediation efforts of the OSCE Minsk Group at the expense of the foreign ministers, yet he made provocative statements about Karabakh, openly pushing Azerbaijan, towards Baku, and at the same time, Yerevan, if Baku starts fighting, "Moscow is behind all this." There were other anti-Russian demarches. Thus, a difficult situation arose: Yerevan provoked the Turkish tendency in Azerbaijan and Russia in different ways, which was well used by Aliyev in political support for military actions during the war" [9];

These factors mainly determined the tactics of Moscow's actions in the Karabakh war, when it first took a pause (although there were telephone communications with Yerevan), then the OSCE Minsk Group took an active part in the preparation of the so-called humanitarian ceasefire. The US and France, as co-chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group, did not go ahead, while Russia engaged in dialogue with Ankara, Baku and Yerevan to end the war in the form of other negotiations" [9];

If Armenia had recognized the independence of Nagorno-Karabakh during the war, Stepanakert would have entered Russia's zone of responsibility, regardless of how Azerbaijan, the Minsk Group and the world community reacted to it. As a result, Moscow is faced with the need to ensure the security of Karabakh and is forced to participate in a military conflict. Under certain circumstances, this could lead to a full-scale war involving other parties, particularly Turkey;

Resulting in a critical situation. Active intervention of Russia was necessary to solve the problem. Armenia was faced with a choice: either lose the entire territory of Nagorno-Karabakh or sign an agreement to end the war.

Thus, the results of the military conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh are as follows:

- 1) the war has stopped, Russian peacekeeping forces are located on the line of communication. So far, neither side has decided to continue hostilities. Like any other country, Azerbaijan has the right to invite foreign armed forces to its territory have, but these forces will not have the status and rights of peacekeeping forces;
- 2) Russia controls the Nagorno-Karabakh and Nakhichevan corridors;
- 3) Russia has now established itself as the only force that can bring peace in the Caucasus;
- 4) Russia will permanently have armed forces both in Armenia and Azerbaijan;
- 5) Russia did not allow itself to be drawn into the conflict, which means a sharp deterioration of partnership relations with Azerbaijan and another complication of relations with Turkey. Since its establishment, the CSTO has demonstrated the first major real successes, it exists not on paper, but as an influential regional power. This, of course, is a big plus for Russia's geopolitical ranking" [9].

Next, we will deal with the question of who benefits from local wars in the world.

If you look at what unites all local wars, then, first of all, it can be noted that such a war "not only destroys competitors, but also brings great benefits, and those who receive these benefits do not have to participate, these massacres themselves" [7].

The mechanism for waging a domestic war is well-designed - however, one does not necessarily win this war, only destroy the economy of competitors.

If you look closely at the national economy of developed countries, you can see that the economy of a number of countries is mainly focused on the military industry. For example, at the moment " US industry accounts for about 65% of military orders, if you reduce these orders, then the entire US economy will be attacked, and the US military-industrial complex is the engine of its economy. To get orders for weapons, you need a constant demand for weapons, otherwise the state the budget will collapse. World War III, with the use of modern missiles of all kinds, including nuclear missiles, does not need weapons manufacturers, in this case, weapons such as tanks, guns, manpower and airplanes will turn out to be easy only up to 44. researches of young scientists for the enemy and lasts only a few minutes in a modern war, this is well understood by everyone" [7].

If we recall history, we can see that the main country that enriched itself during the Second World War was the USA. The US economy boomed during these wars because: first, the war was not fought on US soil, unlike the economies of Europe and Japan, respectively, whose economies were not destroyed; secondly, the US was the main producer of military equipment for the Entente countries in the First World War and for the anti-Hitler coalition in the Second. The arms trade, the mass supply of weapons led to the accumulation of gold reserves of the time in the United States.

Thus, local military conflicts reflect the interests of transnational capital and the political circles of advanced capitalist countries, primarily the United States. But, of course, military corporations are interested in local wars and those who make huge profits from the supply of weapons to military zones.

At the same time, although a country is enriching itself, it is clear that thousands and millions of refugees appear in countries where wars are being waged and people are dying, where production and economy are being destroyed. For example, "Since 1955, the civil war in the south of Sudan has not stopped. Weapons are supplied to Sudan from all over the world. The warring parties can find weapons from China, Iran, Russia and others. At the same time, the decree of Russian President Vladimir Putin in 2004 prohibited the supply of weapons to Sudan, but trade continues. According to recent reports, Sudan has started supplying weapons to Syria, and Sudan itself has an embargo on arms exports. It is a market economy that has become a war economy, where everyone tries to profit from selling weapons to hot spots" [10].

At the same time, the excuses for supplying weapons may be different. Thus, China explains the need to provide Sudan with military equipment by the fact that most of the oil fields are located in the war-torn Northern regions of the country. On the other hand, China is investing heavily in these areas, which means they should help Sudan protect its oil infrastructure. At the same time, it should not be forgotten who contributed to the development of inter-ethnic and territorial conflicts in this country, the former colony of Sudan since the declaration of independence in 1956 — Britain and the United States of America.

In 2011, South Sudan declared its independence. Since then, the United States has been on the territory of South Sudan, presumably to preserve the country's sovereignty. Although, of course, the real reasons are to protect US geopolitical interests in South Sudan.

Of course, Sudan is one of the many countries that has fallen victim to its advantageous geographical location. Similar scenarios can be seen in the recent history of many countries.

Therefore, local wars are needed that do not have the objective of destroying or occupying the territories of the presumed enemy. Civil wars, wars against terrorism are the best you can think of for profit.

Thus, it can be concluded that modern local wars are distinguished by their interstate character, that is, in addition to the two combatants, other states with their own interests also participate in them. The existing system of international treaties and agreements allows the parties to the conflict to receive various types of assistance from allied countries. As a result, a local war takes on the characteristics of a coalition war, which in turn can lead to an expansion of its scope.

Domestic military conflicts reflect the interests of transnational capital and the political circles of developed capitalist countries, primarily the United States. But, of course, both military corporations and those who make huge profits from the supply of weapons to military regions are interested in local wars.

At the same time, although a country is enriching itself, it is clear that thousands and millions of refugees appear in countries where wars are being waged and people are dying, where production and economy are being destroyed. Therefore, local wars are needed that do not have the objective of destroying or occupying the territories of the presumed enemy.

Evaluating the prospects for the development of local wars in the world, it can be noted that there will be local wars in the near future, and this cannot be avoided for only one reason: superpowers like the United States need them. Modern wars are not fought for victory, but for super profits.

In short, there will be local wars in the near future, and this cannot be avoided for one reason only: these local wars are necessary to benefit powerful countries like the US and China.

References

1. Ўзбекистон Республикаси Мудофаа вазирининг «Ўзбекистон Республикаси Мудофаа доктринаси – мамлакатнинг ҳарбий соҳада миллий хавфсизлигини таъминлашнинг асоси» мавзусида ўтказилган илмий-амалий анжуманида “Кириш сўзи”(2018 йил 27 январь, академия катта мажлислар зали).
2. «Ўзбекистон Республикаси Мудофаа доктринаси – мамлакатнинг ҳарбий соҳада миллий хавфсизлигини таъминлашнинг асоси» мавзусида илмий-амалий анжуманидан “полковник Тоиров Азизжон Икромовичнинг маърузаси” (2018 йил 27 январь, академия катта мажлислар зали).
3. Россия Федерацияси Президентининг 30.11.2016 йилдаги 640-сонли "Россия Федерацияси ташқи сиёсати концепциясини тасдиқлаш тўғрисида" ги фармони // спс "Consultant плюс".
4. Ҳарбий энциклопедия. - М.: Билим, 2003-Жилд. 4. — 790 п.
5. Горбачёв, А. В., Омелчак В. Р. маҳаллий урушлар: инсоният мавжудлигига таҳдид // тўпламда: ХХИ аср ёшлари: келажакка қадам. XVIII минтақавий илмий-амалий конференция материаллари. - Благовешченск, 2017. - 55-58 бетлар. Сиёсатшунослик 45
6. Клаузевиц, К. уруш ҳақида. - М., 1932. — 315 п.
7. Дунёда маҳаллий урушлар кимга керак ва нима учун. - Кириш режими: [http://www . ДУНЁ уруши. су/геополитика/811-комуи-зачем-нужний-локальные-войны-в-мире](http://www.duneh.com/геополитика/811-комуи-зачем-нужний-локальные-войны-в-мире) (кириш 28.04.2021).
8. Малйшева, Е. М. тарихдаги Жаҳон урушлари ва маҳаллий ҳарбий тўқнашувлар: оқибатлари, сабоқлари // Адигея Давлат университети Бюллетени. - 2005. - 1-сон. 69-73 бетлар.
9. Қорабоғ урушининг янги тафсилотлари ва уни тугатишда Россиянинг роли. - Кириш режими: [https://news-front . маълумот](https://news-front.ru) (кириш 11.05.2021).
10. Полша, Е. урушдаги бизнес ва нефт билан лаънатланган мамлакатлар. - Кириш режими: [https://www . правда. ру / иктисодиёт / 1256741-бизнес](https://www.prawda.ru/иктисодиёт/1256741-бизнес)(кириш 28.04.2021).
11. Чураков, Д. О. кичик урушлар ва маҳаллий можаролар: илмий нутқ муаммолари // Локус: одамлар, жамият, маданиятлар, маънолар. - 2018. - 4-сон. - 134-139 бетлар.

12. Шабловский, В. С. Украинадаги инкироз шароитида Россия ва НАТО ўртасидаги муносабатлар // поссовет тадқиқотлари. — 2019. - 3-сон. - 44-46 бетлар.
13. <http://www.Кремл.ру/асц/банк/41451/паге/4> (кириш 11.03.2019).
14. Usmonov M. T. The Purpose, Function and History Of The Development Of Mathematical Science. International Journal of Engineering and Information Systems (IJEAIS) ISSN: 2643-640X Vol. 5 Issue 1, January - 2021, Pages: 8-17.
15. Usmonov M. T. True and False Thoughts, Quantities. International Journal of Academic Information Systems Research (IAISR) ISSN: 2643-9026 Vol. 5 Issue 1, January - 2021, Pages: 1-5.
16. Usmonov M. T. Virtual Protected Networks. International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research (IJAPR) ISSN: 2643-9123 Vol. 5 Issue 1, January - 2021, Pages: 55-57.
17. Usmonov M. T. What Is Solving The Problem? Methods of Solving Text Problems. International Journal of Engineering and Information Systems (IJEAIS) ISSN: 2643-640X Vol. 5 Issue 1, January - 2021, Pages: 56-58.