

## THIRD-PARTY USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND SANCTIONS IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION

*Nosirbekov Kozimbek Sunnatbek ugli*

*4<sup>th</sup>-year student of the specialty "Political Science"*

*Journalism and Mass Communications University of Uzbekistan*

*Sharobiddinov Shokhislombek Yasharbek ugli*

*4<sup>th</sup>-year student of the specialty "Political Science"*

*Journalism and Mass Communications University of Uzbekistan*

**Annotation:** Humanity has always involved a third party to solve conflicts, which helped to find a peaceful solution to the complex situation between the conflicting parties. Usually, the most respected people in society acted as third parties. They judged who was right and who was wrong and made the right decisions about the conditions under which peace should be made. But in some cases, the problem reaches such a complex level that armed forces have to be used as the only measure in the process of solving the problem. This article discusses the use of armed force and sanctions in conflict resolution by third parties.

**Keywords:** conflict; interventions; third-party; peace; techniques; conflict situations.

Of all the means of restraint and coercion used by a third party, the most common are peacekeeping operations (this term was introduced by the UN General Assembly in February 1965), as well as the application of sanctions against conflicting parties. In the framework of legal sciences, issues related to peacekeeping operations and the application of sanctions are studied in detail. However, they also have political aspects that need to be taken into account.

Peacekeeping operations often involve peacekeepers. This happens when the conflict reaches the stage of armed struggle. The main goal of the peacekeeping forces is to separate the opposing parties, prevent armed conflicts between them, and control the armed actions of the opposing parties.

As peacekeeping forces, they can be used as military units of individual countries (for example, in the second half of the 80s, Indian troops were in Sri Lanka as peacekeepers, and in the early 90s, the 14th Russian army was in Transnistria) or a group of countries (according to the decision of the Organization of African Unity, in the early 1980s, the Inter-African Force participated in the resolution of the conflict in Chad) and the armed forces of the United Nations (UN armed forces were used several times).

Assistance from the armed forces of the United Nations ("blue helmets") is often

called upon in an armed conflict. They are multinational structures, their structure is provided for in the UN Convention based on the decision of the Security Council. The idea of using armed forces under the auspices of the UN was proposed and supported by Canadian Foreign Minister L. Pearson (for which he received the Nobel Peace Prize) during the Suez crisis in 1956. By D. Hammarskjöld, the Secretary General of the UN at that time. Later, UN troops participated in peacekeeping operations in Africa, Asia, Europe, and Central America. Thus, in 1973, UN troops were immediately deployed in the Middle East, which allowed to reduce the tension caused by the deep penetration of Israeli troops into the territory of Egypt. The armed forces of the United Nations have performed peacekeeping functions in Cyprus, Lebanon, and many other "hot spots" of our planet. Peacekeepers can stay in the conflict zone for a long time, even after reaching an agreement, as in Cyprus, where their mission was to prevent clashes between representatives of the Greek and Turkish communities. In Cyprus, they ensured that a new phase of armed conflict did not begin.

Before the use of the peacekeeping forces of the United Nations, the activities of military observers were carried out, and later they had a much wider practice. A group of UN military observers visited India and Pakistan and the Middle East. The task of military observers (and this is what distinguishes them from "negotiation process observers") is mainly to monitor the implementation of the ceasefire, to identify the facts of its violations, and to submit a report to the UN Security Council.

At the same time as peacekeeping forces are introduced, a buffer zone is often created to separate the armed formations of the opposing sides. The introduction of no-fly zones is also implemented to prevent airstrikes by one of the parties to the conflict. In particular, such zones were introduced in the airspace of Bosnia and Herzegovina based on UN Security Council Resolution No. 781 of October 9, 1992, and in March 1993, after this resolution, the Security Council adopted a new use of all necessary means. measures in case of further violation of the airspace.

In some conflicts, additional functions were assigned to the military, including the delivery of humanitarian aid to the civilian population (this function was actively implemented, in particular, in the Bosnian conflict), ensuring free elections (for example, in Namibia).

Peacekeeping operations are carried out by the UN as well as regional intergovernmental organizations. Some of them have their armed forces (for example, the Inter-American Armed Forces was created under the Organization of American States in 1965), and some do not have their armed forces or use the armed forces of other countries for other reasons. organizations or countries. Thus, in July 1992, the UN authorized the OSCE (which later became the OSCE) to conduct, among other things, peacekeeping operations. In particular, NATO forces were used

for this task.

The introduction of third-party troops helps to resolve conflicts, primarily due to the difficulty of combat operations of opposing parties. In recognition of this fact and the contribution of the UN in this field, in 1988 UN peacekeeping forces were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. However, along with the positive aspects, the use of armed units has several limitations and negative aspects.

First of all, peacekeeping troops cannot always be taken. Countries into whose territory they are included must agree to deploy them (consent does not apply, for example, to peacekeeping operations against Iraq due to the invasion of Kuwait in 1991). Countries may refuse to accept the introduction of peacekeeping troops, considering it to be interference in their internal affairs. The issue of the neutrality of the armed forces is very acute: how neutral the opposing sides perceive them and do not support one side or the other in the conflict. They are often attacked by both sides, accused of bias and bias.

The question of neutrality is especially difficult to resolve when a third party conducts military operations to "punish" one of the parties to the conflict for non-compliance with agreements or aggressive behavior towards the other. For example, NATO practiced bombing in the Bosnian conflict. At that time, for example, doubts about the objectivity of assessing the actions of the conflicting parties, which were repeatedly emphasized by the Bosnian Serbs, immediately appeared.

The problem of neutrality can be partially solved by simultaneously introducing different troops (collective peacekeeping forces). Thus, during the resolution of the conflict in South Ossetia in the early 1990s, Russian, Georgian, and Ossetian units of peacekeeping forces were brought there at the same time.

Such actions allow to increase the level of "impartiality" to a certain extent, although they do not eliminate the problem: even if different countries send peacekeeping troops at the same time, they can be accused of bias. In addition, with the introduction of collective peacekeeping forces, another problem often arises - inconsistency in the assessment of the situation by various participants in the peacekeeping process. In this case, the effectiveness of their actions is questioned. In addition, there is a risk of conflict between the countries whose troops are included.

Another way to slightly increase the level of acceptance of the troops introduced as neutral is to follow the UN principle, according to which a country located in the region and directly or indirectly interested in the conflict is subjected. results are usually not included in the calculation. For the same reason, the dominant power in the region should not have any advantage in carrying out peace efforts. However, this principle is difficult to apply in practice. The argument here is, as a rule, to protect national security and ensure the rights of citizens in a conflict zone.

It should also be taken into account that the powers of peacekeepers are limited:

for example, they do not have the right to pursue an attacker, and they can only use weapons in self-defense. In such conditions, they can become specific targets for opposing groups, as has happened several times in different regions. In addition, cases of hostage-taking by peacekeeping forces were observed. Thus, in the first half of 1995, Russian soldiers who were on a peacekeeping mission there were also taken hostage in the Bosnian conflict.

At the same time, giving peacekeepers more powers, including giving them policing functions, allowing them to carry out airstrikes, etc., is fraught with the risk of expanding the conflict and involving a third party in internal problems. possible victims - civilians, division of opinion within the third party about the legality of the measures taken. Thus, actions authorized by NATO:

The United Nations and the bombing of Bosnian Serb positions in Bosnia in the mid-1990s, which in turn led to intense debate about the role of the UN and NATO in resolving the Bosnian conflict between Russia, on the one hand, came on the one hand, NATO member states on the other.

NATO's authorization from the United Nations to act in the armed conflict in Bosnia created another problem - the decision on the nature of the intervention. The fact is that the transfer of the right to solve this issue to the executive increased the effectiveness of the decisions made, but at the same time, to a certain extent, limited the activity of the international organization itself - in this case, the UN - in this regard. conflict resolution.

Third-party peacekeepers are also facing the problem of financing the armed forces. The use of peacekeeping troops requires significant costs. Thus, in 1992 alone, 1.5 billion dollars were spent from the UN budget for these purposes, and in 1993, even more.

The presence of troops on the territory of another country is also a problem. This is not always easily resolved within the framework of the national legislation of the countries that provide their armed forces. In addition, the involvement of troops in resolving conflicts abroad is often negatively perceived by the public, especially when there are casualties among peacekeepers.

And finally, the biggest problem is that the introduction of peacekeeping forces cannot replace a political solution to the conflict. This move can only be considered temporary while a peaceful solution is being sought.

Another common, restrictive, and coercive effect of a third party on conflict participants is the use of sanctions. Sanctions are widely used in international practice. They are introduced by states on their initiative or by the decision of international organizations. In the event of a threat to peace, a breach of peace, or an act of aggression by any country, sanctions are provided for in the UN Convention on Conflict.

Unlike the introduction of peacekeeping forces, sanctions do not require the consent of the person being used. There are different types of sanctions. Trade sanctions apply to the import and export of goods and technology that can be used for military purposes. Financial sanctions include prohibitions or restrictions on loans, credits, and investments. Political sanctions are also used, for example, excluding the aggressor from international organizations, and breaking diplomatic relations with him.

Common arguments for sanctions against belligerents include:

- development of relations with a country that does not seek to resolve conflicts peacefully - political and economic support for this conflict;
- many types of products, especially in the electronics industry, can be used by the parties to the conflict for military purposes, which further intensifies the conflict;
- if foreign firms or foreign capital play an important role in the economy of conflict countries, their withdrawal will weaken the regime of the authorities and this may help to change its policy towards the conflict.

In addition to positive aspects, sanctions, such as the introduction of armed forces by a third party, have many negative consequences. Firstly, sanctions alone cannot solve the problem of resolving the conflict by political means. Sanctions aimed at encouraging participants to end the conflict lead to the isolation of these countries from the outside world. As a result, the possibility of external influence to seek a peaceful solution to the conflict is limited.

As I. Galtung has shown, sanctions can increase the cohesion of groups within the conflicting party, and also help to support the national leader who is in favor of the continuation of the conflict. In social thought, the main enemy is not the one who initiates the conflict, but the one who uses punitive measures. Such an effect of sanctions was noted, for example, in Yugoslavia and Iraq in the 90s.

Sanctions sometimes have the opposite effect: they polarize society rather than unify it, which in turn leads to unpredictable consequences. Thus, in a polarized society, extremist forces can become active, and as a result, the conflict will only intensify. Of course, another version of the development of events cannot be ruled out, for example, when, as a result of polarization, the forces oriented towards compromise dominate the society - in this case, the probability of a peaceful resolution of the conflict increases significantly.

It complicates the use of sanctions because they act not selectively, but for the whole society, and mainly the most vulnerable sections of the population suffer. To reduce this negative impact, partial sanctions are sometimes used, which do not affect, for example, the supply of food or medicine. Of course, the problem remains: how to get this delivery to the recipient.

Another problem is that the application of sanctions will not only harm the

economy of the country where they are applied but also the economy of the country that is applying the sanctions. This is especially the case when these countries had close economic and trade ties and relations before the sanctions were imposed. For example, the introduction of sanctions against Iraq after the invasion of Kuwait in the summer of 1990 harmed the Russian economy. Therefore, for economic reasons, not all countries can always agree to sanctions, even if they support them politically. This will reduce the impact of sanctions. Thus, in the case of the introduction of sanctions against South Africa during the apartheid period, some African countries were forced to maintain trade and economic relations with South Africa, while officially supporting the sanctions against South Africa due to their multifaceted dependence on South Africa.

In addition to the points mentioned above, the question of the effectiveness of sanctions remains problematic, because often the country that applies them can use domestic reserves or rely on the assistance of other countries that have not joined the sanctions. K. Mitchell analyzed various cases of the application of sanctions in the international practice of 1945-1970. and they showed that most of the goals included were not achieved. The introduction of sanctions against Yugoslavia by the socialist countries in 1948-1955 is one of these examples. to force him to abandon more independent behavior. Sanctions were lifted in 1955, which did not have a significant impact on the country's leadership. In 1951, Arab countries introduced sanctions (in particular, a trade embargo) against Israel to weaken its economy and soften its position towards the Palestinians.

As a result, not only Israel, but the trade and economic potential of the entire region was damaged, and the set goals were not achieved. However, there are other examples. In 1960, the United States imposed sanctions against the Dominican Republic to change its foreign policy, which it believed threatened peace and security in the hemisphere. Sanctions included an embargo on weapons and military supplies, and later on gasoline and oil products. The case ended with the fall of the ruling regime. However, it is unclear to what extent the sanctions caused the changes that occurred.

Disadvantages and limitations of sanctions and the use of peacekeeping forces After the end of the Cold War, in the early 1990s, attempts to influence conflicts in Yugoslavia and some other "hot spots" were particularly intense. started to be discussed. "The use of these tools was not successful.

And yet, there are compelling reasons for third-party intervention in the conflict, including sanctions and peacekeeping forces. It is not a question of whether or not to use these means of influence, but how to reduce their negative aspects and increase their effectiveness. When solving it, first of all, it is important to weigh the pros and cons in each specific case, as well as to find the optimal balance of various means of

influence.

The flexible use of various tools, depending on the specific characteristics of the conflict, will greatly contribute to reducing the negative effects. For example, the very nature of applying and lifting sanctions is a means of influencing the country where they are applied. Thus, as the internal political situation in South Africa developed in a positive direction, the sanctions imposed by many countries began to be gradually eased. In July 1991, US President George W. Bush lifted the sanctions imposed on the Republic of South Africa by the 1986 law, as the South African government fulfilled the conditions listed therein: lifting the state of emergency, and lifting the ban on activities. representatives of political organizations agreed to hold negotiations with representatives of the black majority and released political prisoners. At the same time, the "Gamma Amendment" remained in force, prohibiting the United States from supporting IMF loans to South Africa, as well as from the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the granting of South African loans, and cooperation with South Africa. Africa in intelligence and arms imports from South Africa. At the end of June 1991, Finland lifted the ban on trade with South Africa and trade-related financial sanctions involving payments, loans, and guarantees, allowing Finnish investment in South Africa, technology transfers to South Africa, and 'prohibited to provide. Non-trade loans to South Africa. A decision similar to Finland was later adopted by Iceland, and then by many other countries.

Sanctions and the deployment of peacekeeping forces should not be considered in isolation from other methods of influencing conflict. Negative moments associated with the use of some methods can be significantly mitigated by the simultaneous use of other forms of activity by a third party. For example, the degree of isolation of a conflict participant during the application of sanctions can be reduced by providing various - formal and informal - mediation services.

#### **REFERENCE**

1. Кременюк В.А. На пути урегулирования конфликтов//США: экономика, политика, идеология. 1990. № 12. В. 47-52.
2. Лебедева М. М. Политическое урегулирование конфликтов: Учеб. пособие. - М.: Аспект Пресс, 1999 – В. 171.
3. Международное право/Под ред. Ю.М. Колосова, В.И. Кузнецова. М.: Международные отно- шения, 1996. В.138.
4. Международные конфликты современности/Под ред. В. И. Гантмана. М.: Наука, 1983.В.179.
5. О процессе международных переговоров (опыт зарубежных исследований)/Отв. редакторы Р.Г. Богданов, В.А. Кременюк. М.: ИСКАН, 1989.В.139-140.
6. Конфликтология : учебник / Г.И. Козырев. — 3-е изд., испр. и доп. — М. : ИД «ФОРУМ» : ИНФРА- М, 2019. В.110-111.