

**NATIONAL INTERESTS IN ENSURING STATE AND SOCIETAL SECURITY IN UZBEKISTAN**

**Ithom Dilmurodov,**  
Associate Professor of  
Uzbekistan State World Languages University,  
Candidate of Philosophical Sciences

**Annotation**

Today, the New Uzbekistan is acting as an independent participant in world politics, and its positions are increasingly taken into account in decision-making processes at both regional and global levels. Therefore, Uzbekistan's renewed political activity has become an important factor in contemporary world politics and international relations. Without considering these processes, it is impossible to provide an objective assessment of major developments in international affairs or to gain a comprehensive understanding of the country's foreign policy. The foreign policy activity of the Republic of Uzbekistan is of crucial importance for ensuring its national, political, and economic independence, as well as its security.

**Keywords:** national interest, subject, social unity, economic need, social need, political situation, objective necessity, objective existence, geographical location, political development, cultural development, international politics.

The experience of the New Uzbekistan's international relations in recent years has demonstrated that pursuing an independent foreign policy, developing its own approaches to integration into the world community, determining the priorities of interstate relations, promoting their development, maintaining peaceful coexistence on the basis of equality, and establishing mutually beneficial cooperation among states have created opportunities for resolving a number of internal and external political issues. In recent years, the leadership of Uzbekistan has gained considerable experience in conducting and participating in negotiations. They actively take part in numerous international meetings and conferences, thereby protecting and promoting our country's national interests.

It is well known that the concept of national interest emerged long ago, beginning from the earliest stages of the formation of sovereign states, as a category employed by political leaders to unite citizens for the purpose of achieving socio-economic development and preventing various threats and dangers. At the core of any national interest lie the objective needs of a subject or social community arising from the economic, social, political, and other conditions in which they exist. Understanding social needs constitutes the process through which people's interests are formed. Thus, interest represents both an objective and a subjective category.

At present, the concept of national interest is widely discussed by researchers, political leaders, journalists, and military officials. Particular attention is paid to this notion in the study of a state's foreign policy, in identifying the interaction between internal and external factors, and in analyzing issues of international relations. In the content of national security concepts and military doctrines, national interests inevitably serve as the foundation for identifying the principal threats to sovereignty and territorial integrity, determining the main directions of foreign policy, developing defense strategies, and ensuring economic development as a key factor of state progress. However, despite its significance, this concept remains subject to considerable debate.

The concept of national interest continues to remain a subject of contradictions and debates due to its significance both as an analytical instrument and as a means of political action. Therefore, the very fact that the concept of national interest is widely employed by representatives of both theoretical and practical approaches deserves particular attention. National interest is regarded as an indicator of objective existence, grounded in the specific

geographical location of a state, its economic, political, and cultural development, as well as certain characteristics of human nature. Consequently, “national interest” serves as a solid foundation of a state’s international policy and manifests itself in practice through state leaders’ awareness of their responsibilities. It follows that a sound policy is one that is based upon a proper understanding of national interests. This also presupposes an understanding of the idea that the distinguishing feature separating international politics from domestic politics is the struggle for power.

National interest differs fundamentally from social interest. While the former is concerned with protecting a country’s interests in the international arena, the latter relates to the system of laws regulating domestic policy within the state. In other words, unlike social interest, the concept of “national interest” belongs primarily to the sphere of foreign policy. The notion of social interest is applied in order to enhance and protect the common good against internal contradictions. As noted above, the diversity of goals pursued by various individuals and groups within the state does not create an equally influential unified force, nor does it allow national interest to be evaluated as an ideal criterion for political leadership.

A state’s foreign policy is reflected in the actions of its leaders, who possess a certain degree of freedom in determining political objectives. In this regard, the ideology, temperament, and other personal qualities of leaders play an important role. However, the conditional aspect of state leaders’ activities lies in the fact that all of their actions are ultimately grounded in national interests. Within such interests, both objective and subjective characteristics may be observed. For this very reason, determining whether interests are objective or subjective remains one of the most pressing issues<sup>1</sup>.

According to scholars who study objective interests, it is dangerous to resort to the arbitrary determination of interests when explaining the behavior of individuals and social groups. For this reason, the issue of the objectivity of interests remains highly complex. The French specialist in international relations, Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, also addressed this point of view.

“Of course, it would be desirable to determine an objective national interest,” he writes, “because in that case it would be much easier to study international relations by comparing the national interests proposed by political leaders with objectively existing national interests. However, any reasoning concerning an objective national interest is itself subjective.”

For example, according to the American scholar Arnold Wolfers, national interest may signify different meanings for different individuals; moreover, it is even capable of giving politics an appearance of attractiveness and legitimacy<sup>2</sup>.

Supporters of liberal ideas cast doubt on the legitimacy of using the concept of national interest as a criterion for either domestic or foreign policy. From this perspective, defining the notion of national interest is considered impossible. Ultimately, researchers propose regarding not interests, but rather national identity as the driving force behind the behavior of participants in international relations. When discussing national identity, reference is made to language and religion, which are grounded in national unity, cultural-historical values, and collective historical memory.

Theorists of liberal thought and their supporters are prepared to acknowledge the existence of national interests only if moral principles and contemporary global issues are recognized within their content. The protection of sovereignty and the aspiration for power are gradually losing their former significance. It is evident that the defense of values and responses to global threats increasingly extend far beyond the boundaries of national borders. Proceeding from this,

<sup>1</sup> Карягин З.Д. Дипломатическая служба: вчера, сегодня и завтра // Международная жизнь. М.:1994. № 10.

<sup>2</sup> Гайтман В.И. Международные конфликты современности. Отв. ред. М.: 1993.

the principal task facing a democratic state today is not only the protection of national interests, but also the safeguarding of moral principles and human rights.

It is contrary to the very essence of national interests for every state leader to act and behave differently in political activity solely on the basis of personal interpretations of those interests. Furthermore, every individual engaged in political activity must first clearly understand the nature of his or her own views. We believe that, in the sphere of international relations and foreign policy, a state leader must possess profound political thinking and clearly identify the priority directions of national interests.

For this very reason, in the New Uzbekistan, clear opportunities have emerged for conducting an independent foreign policy, developing bilateral and multilateral relations, and implementing a sovereign foreign policy grounded in national interests.

The Main Directions of the Foreign Policy of the New Uzbekistan:

First, national interests constitute the primary priority of Uzbekistan's foreign policy;

Second, the supremacy of universal human values and the principles of international legal documents in interstate relations;

Third, the priority of equality and mutual benefit in foreign policy;

Fourth, the implementation of the principle of openness and transparency in foreign policy regardless of ideological differences;

Fifth, the supremacy of international legal norms over domestic national legislation;

Sixth, the establishment and development of bilateral as well as multilateral foreign relations.

In order to achieve these goals and further improve relations with the international community, a system of national mechanisms for foreign policy activity has been established.

At present, the concept of national interests has not lost its political and analytical significance. For this very reason, one of the founders of the theory of political realism, Hans Morgenthau, paid deep attention to the content of this concept. In his view, national interest remains a fundamental category for all states, and ignoring it or making mistakes in its interpretation can be extremely dangerous. National interest embodies the interests of all citizens and encompasses a wide range of objective socio-economic and other factors. Therefore, global economic processes, state policies, and various other influences constantly contribute to the transformation of national interests.

Debates about national interests have intensified in the contemporary world. According to representatives of liberalism, we tend to overestimate the role of national interests while insufficient attention is paid to their psychological dimensions. In their view, in authoritarian and totalitarian societies, state interests dominate over individual interests, whereas in democratic societies, the principle of statehood implies that "national interests are formed as the sum of citizens' interests"<sup>3</sup>. Some researchers attempt to combine ethnic and state groups and introduce the term "national-state interests." There are also scholars who interpret nations as political subjects and argue that, when discussing the concept of national interest, one should first abandon the idea that "nationality" is necessarily linked to ethnicity.

When analyzing the priority of national interests in domestic and foreign policy, we can observe that fundamental national interests are based on geopolitical, cultural, and economic factors. Therefore, we study interests by dividing them into categories such as primary and secondary, objective and subjective, real and artificial, as well as compatible and mutually exclusive or intersecting and non-intersecting interests.

Based on the above considerations, the concept of "interest" can be defined as the conscious needs of a subject arising from the fundamental conditions of its existence and activity. Accordingly, national interest is the expression and implementation of state needs in the

<sup>3</sup> Морозов Г.И. Международные организации. Некоторые вопросы теории. М.: 1994.

activities of its leaders. This also applies to multiethnic and ethnically diverse states: in essence, national interest refers to national-state interests.

According to Raymond Aron, decisions regarding the goals of any state correspond to the traditional realist understanding of national interests. From Aron's perspective, enduring goals—both abstract and concrete—may manifest as the expansion of political influence, territorial enlargement, population growth, and the ability to “capture the human spirit” within a given political entity's sphere of influence.

Justifying the legitimacy of using the concept of “national interest” as a conceptual basis and analytical tool of foreign policy does not mean limiting it only to the clearly defined elements expressed in official state documents. At the same time, it also acknowledges that some important aspirations of social solidarity, which are not included in formal international relations terminology, may be overlooked, creating certain conceptual gaps.

Terms such as “national spirit” or “national unity” do not directly express the hidden elements of national interest in a form that is immediately observable. For this reason, some authors attempt to introduce the notion of “involuntary factors” of national interest. Taking this into account, Vadim Mezhuev suggests that the applicability of national interest policy is reflected in several key factors<sup>4</sup>.

Some researchers attempt to combine ethnic and state groups and introduce the term “national-state interests.” There are also scholars who interpret nations as political subjects and argue that, when discussing the concept of national interest, one should first abandon the idea that “nationality” is necessarily linked to ethnicity.

When analyzing the priority of national interests in domestic and foreign policy, we can observe that fundamental national interests are based on geopolitical, cultural, and economic factors. Therefore, we study interests by dividing them into categories such as primary and secondary, objective and subjective, real and artificial, as well as compatible and mutually exclusive or intersecting and non-intersecting interests.

Based on the above considerations, the concept of “interest” can be defined as the conscious needs of a subject arising from the fundamental conditions of its existence and activity. Accordingly, national interest is the expression and implementation of state needs in the activities of its leaders. This also applies to multiethnic and ethnically diverse states: in essence, national interest refers to national-state interests.

According to Raymond Aron, decisions regarding the goals of any state correspond to the traditional realist understanding of national interests. From Aron's perspective, enduring goals—both abstract and concrete—may manifest as the expansion of political influence, territorial enlargement, population growth, and the ability to “capture the human spirit” within a given political entity's sphere of influence.

Justifying the legitimacy of using the concept of “national interest” as a conceptual basis and analytical tool of foreign policy does not mean limiting it only to the clearly defined elements expressed in official state documents. At the same time, it also acknowledges that some important aspirations of social solidarity, which are not included in formal international relations terminology, may be overlooked, creating certain conceptual gaps.

Terms such as “national spirit” or “national unity” do not directly express the hidden elements of national interest in a form that is immediately observable. For this reason, some authors attempt to introduce the notion of “involuntary factors” of national interest. Taking this into account, Vadim Mezhuev suggests that the applicability of national interest policy is reflected in several key factors.

---

<sup>4</sup> Афанасьев В.Г. Общество: системность, познание и управление. М.:1996.

## REFERENCES

1. Ўзбекистан Республикаси Президентининг 2017 йил 7 февралдаги ПФ- 4947-сонли “2017-2021 йилларда Ўзбекистан Республикасини ривожлантиришнинг бешта устувор йўналиши бўйича Ҳаракатлар стратегияси тўғрисида”ги Фармони.
2. Мирзиёев Ш.М. Танқидий таҳлил, қатъий тартиб-интизом ва шахсий жавобгарлик - ҳар бир раҳбар фаолиятининг кундалик қондаси бўлиши керак. Мамлакатимизни 2016 йилда ижтимоий-иқтисодий ривожлантиришнинг асосий яқунлари ва 2017 йилга мўлжалланган иқтисодий дастурнинг энг муҳим устивор йўналишларига бағишланган Вазирлар Маҳкамасининг кенгайтирилган мажлисидаги маъруза, 2017 йил 14 январь// Ш.М. Мирзиёев, Тошкент: Ўзбекистан, 2017 -104 б.
3. Мирзиёев Ш.М. Буюк келажакимизни мард ва олийжаноб халқимиз билан кураимиз. Мазкур китобдан Ўзбекистан Республикаси Президенти Ш. Мирзиёевнинг 2016 йил 1 ноябрга қадар Қорақалпоғистон Республикаси, вилоятлар ва Тошкент шаҳри сайловчилари вакиллари билан ўтказилган сайловолди учрашувларида сўзлаган нутқлари ўрин олган.т/ Ш.М. Мирзиёев. Тошкент: “Ўзбекистан”, 2017. - 488 б.
4. Халқаро муносабатлар. “Академия”. 2006 й.
5. Давлатлар ва халқаро ташкилотлар. “Академия”. 2005 й.
6. Алимов Р. Центральная Азия: общность интересов. “Шарқ”. 2005 й.