

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716  
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

## International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 11 Volume: 79

Published: 30.11.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



**Asliddin Tursunovich Kuldoshev**  
Samarkand State Architectural and Construction Institute  
Head of the Department of Social Sciences  
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), associate professor  
[asli-0708@mail.ru](mailto:asli-0708@mail.ru)

## SYNERGISTIC APPROACH TO MANAGING GLOBAL ECOLOGICAL POLITICAL RELATIONS

**Abstract:** In the article presents a synergistic approach to global environmental policy management in the complex systematic functioning of global environmental policy management institutions.

**Key words:** global environmental policy, management, control, security, institutional system, political relations.

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Kuldoshev, A. T. (2019). Synergistic approach to managing global ecological political relations. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 11 (79), 560-564.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-11-79-116> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.11.79.116>

**Scopus ASCC:** 3320.

### Introduction

Nowadays, integration of synergetics with other philosophical teachings in the structural and functional analysis of the system of international political institutions, coordinating the **negative fluctuations** of the globalization and aggravating environmental situation and the **bifurcation** of scientific relations is manifested as a more universal theoretical and methodological basis for a comprehensive systematic study of the functions of the institutions of global ecological policy management. "It is the complex systematic scientific analysis of the main motives, driving mechanisms, principles, the development of its theoretical methodological foundations, the effectiveness of the organization, management and control of global ecological policy. After all, such an approach ensures scientific activity in the area of environmental protection, resource conservation and ecologically sustainable safety"[1].

The synergetic approach (as one of the alternative philosophical methodological bases) in factorial and functional analysis of the elements constituting its structure, the effectiveness of historic, logical, comprehensive, systematic study of the globalization process of international ecological political relations, has a significant scientific and practical significance.

According to synergistic researches of the structure of the global system for managing international ecological political relations, the view as a unit of "need - purpose - tool - result - benefit" represents its integrative and universal nature. In this global system, the environmental policy of individual countries is its main subject, and the above system demonstrates the relative independence and individuality of each entity in managing international ecological political relations. As each of the relatively independent political activities of the Countries in any area has a concrete method and means of achieving a specific goal, the environmental policy also applies ways and means that are adequate to meet human needs in a decent natural environment. Particularly, global aggravation of the ecological situation requires the integration of each state's environmental policies into political relations aimed at meeting the needs of humanity, that is, to unify their common goals and means.

The institutional system of global ecological policy management is a common and integrated form of universal human needs. That is, the institutional system of managing geoeological relations adequately to meet these needs is being improved in both horizontal and vertical directions[2]. In the process of development of the institutional system of management of international ecological political

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

relations in the horizontal and vertical directions: on the one hand, there are new elements in the system and their functional differentiation is enhanced. On the other hand, the emergence of new areas of ecological political activity (for example, ecological intervention, expansions), and the globalization of international ecological political relations will rise to a new level. That is, in the process of differentiation and functionalization of activities of individual countries: 1) the growing need of the humanity for global ecological management institutions is an objective necessity and is relevant to the present historical period; 2) aggravation and escalation of local, regional geoeological political situation creates new structural elements of the institutional system of management of international ecological relations; 3) as the interactions of the elements of the system “nature-society-man” become more complex, the “sectors” of their management will be expanded; 4) ecologicization of socio-economic relations, forms of social consciousness, education system will become a priority of state policy; 5) the national ecological movement is becoming popular, its links with international related organizations are strengthened, functionally entering a new phase of development and becoming more active[3]. Apart from these, the most important difference between them in managing other areas of communication – it corresponds to the needs and interests of a person in a pure ecological environment, regardless of social stratification, ethnodemographic composition, economic status, political status, confessional affiliation, and ideological position. That is, the institutional structure and functions of the system for managing environmental political relations are based on universal universal democratic and humanistic principles.

The synergistic functional analysis of the structure of the international ecological political management system is based on futurological scientific hypotheses about the dynamics of its dynamic development, namely the prospects for the identification of chaos and order relations. Because the global ecological policy system is not a static phenomenon, but its structural elements and functions are dynamically changing, modernizing, and changing from chaos to order[4]. If we look at ecological policy in the context of the phenomenon of culture, we can see in the literature about the stages of its development that formative, civilized and complex systematic approaches have been formed. But the common disadvantage of all of these approaches is their inability to show the normalization and interconnectedness of a deterministic relation to certain factors or their components.

Formal environmental policy and its international relations coincide with the establishment of national countries and determination period of their geographical boundaries. This is primarily due to the

protection of pastures, forests and other natural resources from the ownerless use of other countries in the context of utilitarian, pure economic interests of a particular state.

The institutional system of global ecological policy specifies the goals of national and regional governments in this area and the ways and means of their implementation. That is why, different approaches to global environmental policy management, their national and regional institutional structure determine both the outcome and the practical significance of scientific research[5].

Each of the subjects of international ecological political relations (at national and regional levels) has a specific function in the process of integration into global politics. The importance and effectiveness of this function is determined first by national, regional and then **global ecological feasibility**. Therefore, countries with relatively independent structural elements of the global ecological policy system are the relatively independent structural elements of international ecological political relations: on the one hand, constitutive - **substantial**, and on the other hand, realizable – **functional**, their integration will contribute to global ecological sustainability.

The effectiveness of the international ecological policy management system depends on its subject’s performance of the following tasks: 1) collection, generalization and systematization of objective information on local, regional, global ecological situation; 2) elaboration of specific projects, plans and plans for addressing ecological issues at all levels (the features of the geoeological space are taken into account here); 3) selection of regional methods and constructive means for the implementation of ecological activities; 4) democratization of ecological political activity and ensuring its popularity and continuity; 5) coordinating the activities of governmental and non-governmental organizations responsible for the organization, management and control of ecological activities.

The institutional system of global ecological policy management is complex in many developed countries, combining national, social, economic and political relations with the common human needs and interests of nature. Because, integrated function of the institutional system of international ecological policy management ensures sustainable development of social and political relations in society.

Generally speaking, **firstly**, the synergetic teachings of environmentalism theory about the system of factors that determine the globalization of international ecological political relations correspond to the level of objective development of the geoeological landscape of the world and its priority is the legal status; **secondly**, the development of an institutional system of global ecological management of global political relations on the bases of modern environmentalism theories is a historical necessity

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

that reflects the combination of humanity's needs and interests; **thirdly**, the dynamic development of the institutional system of global ecological policy requires integration of the processes of fluctuation and bifurcation in the integration and functional differentiation of ecological activities of its subjects; **fourthly**, the effectiveness of each entity in managing the processes of integration and globalization of international ecological political relations depends on the scientific-theoretical and methodological foundations of factual and functional analysis of its constituent elements; **fifthly**, the improvement of the institutional system for managing global ecological political relations in both horizontal and vertical directions depends on the effectiveness of other methods, means of management.

In the system of international ecological political relations, the relatively independent national ecological policies of the countries and their institutional systems are not only the subject, but also the object of global ecological policy. Especially now, on the one hand, as a result of the democratization of international political relations, there is an increasing role of countries in the management of international political processes, regardless of their geographical location, level of economic development, political status, confessional composition and other indicators. On the other hand, each state's national ecological policy and its management system are becoming a direct target of integrated global ecological policy. Because the main function of global ecological policy management is to coordinate the ecological activities and international relations of the national countries. In the conditions of globalization of ecological problems, the independence and freedom of any state is conditional and relative, irrespective of its social, economic and political development. However, positive results of environmental policy in various countries also form the object of the concept of "ecologic society", "ecologic region", "ecological country". For example, in several developed European countries, ecological indicators have become an important criterion (standard) for socio-economic development of society[6].

At present, aggravation and globalization of ecological problems is on the agenda of modeling the international ecological policy management system and its model should be based on the following principles. That is: 1) in order to clarify the general structure of the model, the freedom and independence of international ecological policy entities in local, national, regional ecological space should be limited to the laws of biosphere equilibrium, and human need for man-made and natural change of nature and its compliance with global interests; 2) the objective conditions and effectiveness of subjective factors in the management of international ecological policy correspond to the level of development of the intellectual potential of the society, that is, the index

of the potential and moral-cultural indexes of the individual ecological logistical, technological, financial, and financial capabilities of each entity, that is, above all, the basis of the model; 3) The quality of the organizational foundations of global ecological policy management (refers to the "technological" process and results of management) inevitably depends on the logistics and intellectual support of its institutional system, so that the model should have a unit of quality and quantity; 4) possibilities of creation, collection, systematization, analysis, generalization and transformation of ecological information bank, in the conditions of the priority of public information, which are essential for the viability of any socio-political model, in particular, global environmental policy model should be taken into account; 5) the model of global ecological policy management should be considered as an opportunity to ensure the universality and viability of local, national, regional models of synthesis according to the dialectic principles, without mechanistic systematization or simple adaptation to the situation; 6) the model of management of international ecological political relations in the global geo-ecological space is important for ensuring the harmonization of processes for the organization, management and control of ecological activities of each country and the identification of strategic objectives.

Although in the modern world there are alternative models of global environmental management, not one of them can claim to be universal. Despite the fact that the existence of such a model is theoretically justified, in practice, the approach of each country (even on its territory), social group, society, layer, class to state environmental policy (including international relations) based on its interests makes it difficult to find solutions to the problem. Nonetheless, it is worth noting the importance of attempts to create a universal model based on generalization and harmonization of alternative models of managing international political relations. If we look at global governance of international environmental political relations in the context of human interests, the model of the objective conditions, the system of subjective factors, and the evaluation criteria will be more specific. That is, the structural and functional integral nature of the model should be integrated into the management system (whether directly or indirectly) of international environmental political relations, covering all types of social, economic and political activities and opportunities for their ecology, and this is a difficult task.

The model of the institutional system of global geoeological policy is formed in the process of development of internal and external ecological political relations of states. In particular, their change and assimilation of nature under the laws of biosphere

## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA (India)</b>	<b>= 4.971</b>	<b>SIS (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland)</b>	<b>= 6.630</b>
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b>	<b>= 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia)</b>	<b>= 0.126</b>	<b>PIF (India)</b>	<b>= 1.940</b>
<b>GIF (Australia)</b>	<b>= 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b>	<b>= 8.716</b>	<b>IBI (India)</b>	<b>= 4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b>	<b>= 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b>	<b>= 5.667</b>	<b>OAJI (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.350</b>

equilibrium does not occur outside of international political relations. In other words, in the global geoeological space, the environmental needs of national nations, their capacity and means for their satisfaction are specified. As a result, national models and alternative concepts of international environmental political relations emerge. The international experience of the national modeling, that is, the experience of the socialization process, shows that they are lagging behind modern requirements. In particular, the inertia and passivity of some states in international environmental political relations are on the agenda of their socialization: strengthening both horizontally and vertically. After all, its level is determined by the participation of states in international environmental political relations.

The emerging model of global environmental policy is "editing" the spheres, types and activities of interstate social, economic, political, spiritual relations. This is especially true now: on the one hand, globalization and aggravation of environmental social problems exacerbates the tendency of their ecologicalization. On the other hand, the integration of the model of international environmental policy management into a systematic historical need for functional integration within the needs and interests of the natural environment provides historical context. In this context, the global model of environmental policy management is relatively stable and universal: it also demonstrates the importance of environmentalizing international social, economic, political, spiritual and moral activities. Because the essence of global environmental policy management is the construction of other social relationships on an ecological basis. At the same time, national environmental policies are not limited to the adaptation or integration of global geoeological policies, but rather the practical transformation of the environment in accordance with the laws of the biosphere balance in a particular micro-region. Consequently, the purpose of national environmental policy management is to meet global needs and to protect the environment, which is its common goal. In other words, each direction of the process of naturalization, change, assimilation and protection of natural resources requires special political means and methods.

At any level of the institutional system of managing political relations (horizontal and vertical), is a specific form of humanity, although it is individual, with the combination of "nature-society-human" relations in a particular geo-ecological space. However, as a result of the individuality of this policy, the environmental pressure of the local, national nature, which has increased the pressure of man's anthropogenic impact on the environment, has now become a global catastrophe. Because in some historical periods, the global geo-geological landscape is formed as a result of some countries' national environmental needs based on utilitarianist-pragmatic

or mercantile interests. However, the demand for global sustainable environmental development and its historical development tend to change the criteria and principles of environmental policy management within the international social relations management system. In particular, the activeness and moral responsibility of national states play a key role in the management of global environmental policy. After all, the level of perfection of the international environmental policy management system and its results depend on the active participation of national states in the management of global environmental policy.

The achievement of national independence by Uzbekistan and the choice of building a democratic legal state and civil society based on a market economy have led to the liberalization of international environmental political relations and the formation of a new institutional system. That is, as an equal subject of global environmental policy, it has become a priority policy of combining universal and national interests. Today, the need for global environmental sustainability is on the agenda of integrating socio-political, moral and ethical approaches to resolving conflicts of various interests. The policy of global environmental management of international relations excludes ethnocentric tendencies of states.

To rationalize the policy of Uzbekistan to strengthen the role of the state of Uzbekistan in the world community, especially in managing international environmental political relations, it is necessary to develop a conceptual strategy of domestic and foreign environmental protection policies. In the end, "... in a world where globalization and competition are growing, we must objectively and critically evaluate our role in the radical changes taking place in the world in order to keep up with the ever-growing demands of life"[7]. This is due to the fact that the state institute is the main mechanism for the creation and transformation of environmental values. Secondly, we need to identify and evaluate objective conditions and subjective factors (in particular, the material, technical and intellectual basis and the socio-psychological environment for the integration of nation-states into global (transnational) socio-economic systems). As the President of Uzbekistan Sh. Mirziyoyev stated: "Our task is to rigorously introduce our own model of development and renewal based on accumulated experience and the best international experience. In this regard, we must work hard to achieve medium and long term goals"[8.]. Ultimately, this assessment provides the basis for identifying new areas of conservation and their scope. Thirdly, it is advisable to clarify the principles and mechanisms of emerging global environmental policy paradigms in the policy of managing international environmental relations in each state. As noted in the report of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Shavkat Mirziyoyev at the



## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

72nd session of the UN General Assembly: "Speaking about the problems of security and stability in Central Asia, we cannot ignore the issue of rational use of the region's shared water resources. We fully support the position of the UN Secretary General, according to which "water, peace and security are inextricably linked." I am convinced that there is no rational way to solve the water problem, except to take into account the interests of the countries and peoples of the region[9, 10].

During the years of independence Uzbekistan has integrated into the regional and global system of management of international ecological political relations with the main task, including its modernization, liberalization of ecological policy, and its legal and regulatory bases. Creation of real opportunities and assignment of specific tasks for

international cooperation in the field of ensuring sustainable ecological development and security of the society to the center for national ecological policy: **firstly**, it is the independence of national ecological policies of each country, equal rights, freedoms and harmonization of activities within the subjects of international relations; **secondly**, is represented in the "socialization" of national and regional ecological policies in democratic principles, their integration and globalization; **thirdly**, will enhance the geoeological policy of national countries and enhance their ability to integrate them into the management system of international ecological political relations; **fourthly**, the possibilities of national countries to integrate international ecological political relations into the institutional system of global management institution will depend on the level of development in other areas.

## References:

1. Mamashokirov, S. (2012). *Fear or reality*. (p.65). Tashkent: "Economics-Finance".
2. Botobayeva, G. (2004). Ekonomicheskiye instrumenti ekologicheskoy politiki v praktike Yevropeyskogo Soyuzu. *Obshestvo i ekonomika*, № 7, p.341.
3. Mamashokirov, S., & Usmonov, E. (2009). *Problemi razvitiye perspektivno-ekologicheskogo bezopasnosti*. (p.132). Tashkent: Nauka.
4. Mohammad, S.A. (2011). Mejdunarodnoye ekologicheskoye pravo v istoricheskoy retrospektive. *YevrAzYu*, №8 (39).
5. Mamashokirov, S. (2013). Dinamika vsemirnogo problem. *T. Falsafa va huquq*, № 3, p. 35.
6. Sartayeva, R.S. (2012). *Ekologiya cheloveka, novaya ontologiya i ustoychivoye razvitiye Kazaxstana*. (p.207). Almata: IFPR KN MON RK.
7. Kuldashev, A. (2014). *Democratic and humanistic principles of environmental relations management in Central Asian countries*. Monograph. (p.143). Tashkent: Science.
8. Karimov, I. (2010). *The Concept of Intensification of Democratic Reforms and Formation of Civil Society in the Country*. (p.6). Tashkent: Uzbekistan.
9. Mirziyoev, Sh. (2018). *Together we will build a free and prosperous democratic Uzbekistan*. Tashkent: Uzbekistan.
10. (n.d.). *Speech of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Shavkat Mirziyoev at the 72nd session of the UN General Assembly*. p. 20.