

AMERICAN MODELS OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Філоненко Д.М.

National Aviation University, Kyiv

Науковий керівник – Ржевська Н.Ф – доктор політ. наук

Keywords: political conflictology, resolution, international relations, negotiation, society, models.

International conflicts have become one of the leading factors of instability in world politics. They are increasingly becoming a sign of growing chaos in international relationship. Their number is growing steadily around the world.

At the same time, there is a continuous evolution of the conflicts, during which their internal structure becomes more complicated and new forms arise, such as: civilizational, ethnopolitical, ethno-confessional conflicts, which are little affected by traditional instruments of political regulation. In addition, modern conflicts are becoming a point of intersection of the interests of the world's largest actors, including the United States. [1, p.22]

The United States of America remains the main state-distributor of ideas about the democratic structure of the state, about the protection of the rights and freedoms of citizens, about civil society, about the law as the highest value for all. And under this aegis, the United States often acts as direct mediators in the course of resolving a number of international conflicts. Even in moments when the national interests of the United States are aimed at supporting one of the parties to the conflict, they try to show that they support both parties to the conflict in order to be in partnership with everyone, gain recognition from everyone and maintain their status as a leading country in the world.

That is why, we can say that the description, characteristics and

assessment of theoretical models of political conflictology in the United States and their application in the framework of practical political conflictology directly associated with foreign policy activities are of great importance not only for this country, but also for the entire system of international relationships in general.

Considering the American models of managing international conflicts themselves, it is worth highlighting two models that directly oppose each other in content. Moreover, it should be noted that the authors of these models not only influenced, but often predetermined the foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, we can say with confidence. that it was these models that became one of the fighters that influenced not only US foreign policy, but also relations between countries on the international arena.[2]

The negotiation and compulsory models for resolving conflict situations used by American theorists and practitioners are directly linked to foreign policy activities, and form the basis of US foreign policy.

The negotiation model, which was developed by Anatol Rapoport, Roger Fisher, William Urey and others, is based on the peaceful solution of international conflicts. The parties to the conflict should try to look for opportunities to respect their interests and, if necessary, be ready for certain compromises that do not violate their basic interests, but at the same time avoid opposing positions, which provokes escalation of the conflict. The model focuses on the equivalence and equality of the conflicting countries and brings them to the status of partners. [3,p.9]

The compulsory model, the most typical representative of which is the economist Thomas Schelling, on the contrary, focuses efforts not on finding a compromise, but on defending one's position and choosing behavior that will ensure victory. It cannot be said that the coercive model completely excludes compromise as a tool for resolving the conflict, but understands it in a peculiar way - either to conduct military operations in a way that minimizes this damage, or to contain the enemy with the threat of war without starting it.[4,p.18]

Today, indeed, the settlement of almost all international conflicts is taking place under the auspices of the United States. But, in spite of this, the American authorities should still update the existing models and develop a more modern scheme for influencing such situations.

American scientist David Callahan calls on the United States to revise the existing models of managing international conflicts and develop common guidelines on the basis of which the United States will take a certain position and make a useful contribution to the process of resolving international conflicts. According to him, conflicts in the modern world are mostly territorial in nature. And at the heart of territorial conflicts are two mutually exclusive principles of international law - the principle of territorial integrity

and the right of peoples to self-determination. And supporting the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination, turning a blind eye to the territorial integrity of states, can lead to endless chaos in the world. [5, p.37]

Conclusions. Modern conflicts require the world community not only to search for new approaches and ways of influencing them, but also to form new paradigms for managing them. Such a paradigm today can only be the concepts and models of conflict management using technologies of information and psychological impact, based on cultural and civilizational traditions.

The balanced policy of American diplomacy in resolving international conflicts, a selective approach to the agenda of bilateral relations delays the peace process and requires a reassessment of the approach, the position of American diplomats in order to achieve concrete results.

References:

1. V.A. Kremenjuk. Contemporary International Conflict: Management Problems. International processes. - 2008, April 24.

2. Schelling, Thomas Around the World Encyclopedia. Universal popular scientific online encyclopedia: http://www.krugosvet.ru/enc/gumanitarnye_nauki/ekonomika_i_pravo/Shelling_Tomas.html

3. Fisher R., Ury U. The path to agreement, or Negotiation without defeat. M: Nauka, 1992 - 158 p.

4. Schelling T. Strategy of the conflict. T. Danilova, ed. Yu. Kuznetsova, K. Sonina. M.: IRISEN (Series «International Relations»), 2007-366 p.

5. Callahan David, «Unwinnable Wars: American Power and Ethnic Conflict».- New York - 1998.