

---

**GEOPOLITICAL POWER IN THE 21ST CENTURY CLASH OF  
TELLUROCRACY AND THALASSOCRACY**

Khikmatov F.Kh.

University of Journalism and Mass Communications of Uzbekistan, Doctor of  
Philosophy (PhD) in Political Science. Senior Lecturer of the Department of Social  
and Political Sciences fatkhulla\_hikmatov@mail.ru Mobile: 99-829-31-01

Хикматов Ф.Х.

Университет журналистики и массовых коммуникаций Узбекистана  
Доктор философии (PhD) в области политических наук. Старший  
преподаватель кафедры «Социальных и политических наук»  
fatkhulla\_hikmatov@mail.ru  
Телефон: 99-829-31-01

**Abstract**

The relationship between tellurocracy and thalassocracy is built on the basis of opposition. This is explained not by the fact that the relationship between them acquires a social character, but also by the fact that their social relations are oriented to "gaining power". The conflict between them develops at different points of the Earth in different degrees and in different forms according to the times. However, for geopolitical dualism, the space is only one - Earth or world geopolitical space. The article analyzes the characteristics of these two geopolitical players and their contemporary trends.

**Keywords:** geopolitics, geopolitical players, geopolitical dualism, tellurocracy, thalassocracy, geopolitical factors, military-strategic components, maritime state civilization, liberal doctrine, strategy competition, civilizational differentiation.

**Introduction**

Today, the characteristics of geopolitical players are becoming equal. But the rules established in the past keep them within their limits today.

In the past, power was exercised according to these criteria. Great Britain became the ruler of the sea. Genghis Khan created his own nomadic civilization by creating a band of cavalry, which was focused on land conquest. By exploiting its space, the power was strengthened, and new institutions were defined.

Geopolitical factors are the strategic tasks and directions of foreign policy and national security of states. Despite the fact that the processes have expanded to the level of a global phenomenon, geopolitical factors remain decisive indicators in determining the strategic tasks and directions of foreign policy and national security of states. In this regard, a theoretical review of the relationship and interaction of geopolitical factors and security problems is important for understanding the nature of state policy on security.

Almost all issues of geopolitics are related to state security. The uniqueness of geopolitical research is primarily determined by the fact that in the study of political situations, geopolitics uses large-scale geographic-spatial categories, studies macro-political processes, and attempts to reveal issues related to long-term factors. This stage of the analysis is of particular importance when looking at the external political aspects of security, its military-strategic components.

Geopolitics is the science of power, continents and their inhabitants. Geopolitics studies geographical, historical, political and other complex factors that are interconnected and have a great influence on the strategic potential of the state.

The main laws of geopolitics are:

1. "The state is a living organism"
2. Geopolitical dualism
3. Strategy competition
4. Civilization differentiation (difference)

It should also be noted that there is no single definition of the concept of "geopolitics" not only in the academic circle, but also among political scientists. Although the existing definitions complement each other to one degree or another, they also contradict each other in certain respects. In turn, there are different views about the object and subject of geopolitics.

Of course, it is not necessary to react negatively to the expressed opinions, but to evaluate them as a natural process related to the formation of geopolitics as a science.

Geopolitics not only shows the main directions of determining the external sources of threats to the country's security, helps to identify possible allies and partners, but also helps to develop the principles of the organization of armed defense, and highlights the main geographical-spatial factors that must be taken into account to create an effective security system.

In this regard, Herodotus' History is consistent with the ancient idea that history should be interpreted geographically and geography historically. Herodotus' phrase geography - "servant of history" can be explained by this situation.

In modern geopolitics, the competition of two cultures, called "tellurocracy" (continental) and "thalassocracy" (sea), occupies an important place within this discipline.

Continental states are characterized by centralization and authoritarian rule. Their territorial scope is of particular importance. For them, space is considered a kind of security and reserve of power.

Maritime countries are characterized by decentralization and democracy. Control over sea communications, surrounding water area and its islands and archipelagos is of great importance.

In 1984, the French political scientist R. Aron established the age-old geopolitical competition between "dry land" (tellurocracy) and "sea" (thalassocracy) when Thucydides revealed the competition between Sparta (dry land) and Athens (sea).

### **Basic Principles of Geopolitics**

For geopolitics, first of all, permanent geographical factors specific to countries or regions are of great importance. More precisely, it is important how the states are located in relation to

land or sea. From this point of view, the basic principles of geopolitics are based on a fundamental dualism that reflects the geographical position of the Earth. The fundamental dualism consists of geographically incompatible tellurocracy - "rule over the land" and thalassocracy - "rule over the seas". So, tellurocracy and thalassocracy can be interpreted as the main principles of geopolitical theory.

For tellurocracy, the geographical area of the state or region is first of all important. It is not only mineral resources or the size of the land area, but also how secure the boundaries of this space are, how the transport and telecommunications system is set up, the state of living standards of the population and similar factors determine the prospects of tellurocracy. For thalassocracy, the structure of the (coastal) water level around the states and regions, as well as the strategic or non-strategic location of the islands and archipelagos close to it, are worthy of attention.

If we look at history, we can see that the location of countries on the land or on the coasts in a certain way influenced the political situation and development of that country, even the emergence of its strategic goals. As an example, the Russian scientist A.K. Glivakovskiy gives the following opinion: "... When talking about political relations, one should first of all dwell on the specific features of the political cultures of landlocked or maritime states. Landlocked (territorial) states are usually centralized and have more authoritarian rule (monarch, dictator, president) is more typical. For maritime countries, decentralization (decentralized), confederal and democratic relations are relatively significant. If in the military sphere, in a land-locked state (tellurocracy), attention is paid to land forces and more funds are allocated to them, In neighboring or landlocked states, the focus is on navies<sup>1</sup>. A clear example of this is the relationship between the former Soviet Union and the United States (during the Cold War).

In international relations between 1946 and 1991, geopolitical dualism rose to its highest point - the US "ruled" over the thalassocracy, and the former USSR "ruled" over the tellurocracy.

The difference between thalassocracy and tellurocracy during the "cold war" period from other periods is that both civilizations were based on a centralized geo-ideological opposition (Marxian socialism and liberal capitalism).

The relationship between tellurocracy and thalassocracy is built on the basis of opposition. This is explained not by the fact that the relationship between them acquires a social character, but also by the fact that their social relations are oriented to "gaining power". The conflict between them develops at different points of the Earth in different degrees and in different forms according to the times. However, for geopolitical dualism, the space is only one - Earth or world geopolitical space.

At this point, we would like to draw your attention to the following comments about Rimland. What countries are included in "Rimland" today? In order to answer this

---

<sup>1</sup> **Geopolitics, geography, and strategy / editors, Colin S. Gray, Geoffrey Sloan. Copyright © 1999 Taylor & Francis. P 127**

question, the representatives of the Atlantism stream, taking into account their geographical location, divide the countries belonging to the "Rimland" into three parts, that is:

□ entities that penetrated into the heartland of Makonan, but belong to the Rimland: China, Mongolia, North Vietnam, Bangladesh, Afghanistan;

□ geopolitically neutral Rimland states: South Korea, Burma, India, Iraq, Syria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Slovenia, Croatia, Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro);

□ countries that belong to Roman lands, but are prone to thalassocracy: Western European countries, Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Thailand.

A very controversial classification. No matter how controversial the mentioned notes are, only one opinion can be said about them. That is, the position of Rimland in the world geopolitical space is increasing. This indicates that it is not just an intermediate space between thalassocracy and tellurocracy, but an important principle.

If we look at the Land and Sea mentality from this point of view, we see that the Sea mentality is malleable, not only malleable, but also exploratory and intellectual.

In particular, Naval Officers today are intellectually superior to Land Officers because Land Officers are steeped in tradition and for them traditional orientation is very important. Two differences appeared before us, sociologists define them as follows: it is either peer or family approach, moving towards them. In one case, the norm set by the family, in another case, the norms set by peers play an important role. But both situations look at life with completely different eyes.

The geopolitical structure of the world is a mechanism of modern politics that works and does not work at the same time. If the aforementioned statute is to be argued, it works, moreover, it is tied to the regional situation of its own country. K. Gadzhiev: "The USA entered the Second World War and opposed its isolationist policy, because the aviation factor reduced the geographical distance of the USA."<sup>2</sup> - writes. Or let's consider another case: the concept of the border of the front loses its relevance, because in the first minute of the war, missiles can fall on different points of the territory<sup>3</sup>.

S. Huntington's clash of civilizations comes from this.<sup>4</sup> Civilizational conflict may increase or decrease.

A. Ivashov determines that the transition to a 2-polar world order will be based on civilization<sup>5</sup>. In this case, Russia should declare itself as a Eurasian country, because none of them belong to Russia separately.

<sup>2</sup> Гаджиев К.С. Геополитика. – М., 2007.-С.31

<sup>3</sup> Гаджиев К.С. Введение в геополитику. – М., 2008. –С.59

<sup>4</sup> Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций. М. 2003

<sup>5</sup> Иванов Л.Г. Россия или Московия? Геополитическое измерение национальной безопасности России. М. 2010

P. Sovitsky points out two reasons for Russia's uniqueness in the geopolitical space<sup>6</sup>. On the one hand, the Tatar-Mongol invasion provided economic growth, as new trade routes were opened, on the other hand, Russia acquired a long-term nomadic social structure, in which the concept of land ownership and strata dependence on states was not considered important.

If we analyze the USA as an example, it did not have these situations and this gave rise to the formation of changing attitudes. US civilization can effectively use the dynamics that the world offers to change the rules of the game. The US security strategy gives the right to introduce new rules of the game.

Marine civilization is formed on the basis of external management indicators, and land civilization is formed on the basis of internal management indicators. Civilization in the first case tends to universalism, and civilization in the second case tends to conservatism. The expansion of universal human rights, the transformation of religious systems, started by the West, can be an example of the first civilization. As an eastern country, Russia retained its pro-Slavic religious system.

M. Ignatieff, professor of human rights at Harvard, defines that these rights depend on culture and civilization. At the same time, although human rights are widely promoted by the West as an unofficial ideology, they are violated by the West in some situations. For example, the events of Kosovo, Bosnia, Afghanistan and Iraq. This is due to time pressure. Imperialism put forward the phrase "if you obey me today, tomorrow I will teach you to live freely."<sup>7</sup>

The new US imperialism has no time for this. If the model of the transition of first democracy and then empire was typical for the USA, today the principle of first empire and then democracy is being promoted.

The US claims the role of empire as a maritime nation civilization. The laws of this civilization are widely used everywhere. Failure to do so may result in penalties. Especially after September 11, other countries had to assume the role of its ally. A neutral situation was unrecognizable to them.

Sea civilization has influence everywhere, Land civilization has a conservative nature and tries to protect itself from outsiders. Russia - USSR and China are examples of this idea.

A.S. Panarin defines that it is typical for the USA to work with information, for Russia and China to work with their fundamental culture and scientific ideas<sup>8</sup>. This distinction suggests that both Maritime and Land civilizations:

□ The land has a large and deep information memory, a large cultural independent area;

<sup>6</sup> Савицкий П. Контингент Евразия. М., 1997

<sup>7</sup> Ignatieff M. The attack on human rights // Foreign Allans. - 2001. - November - December; *Игнатъефф М. Многообразие // www.internews.ru*

<sup>8</sup> Панарин А.С. Глобальное политическое прогнозирование. М. 2010. С. 322-323

□ the information revolution will depend more on technology adoption issues than technology production types.

It can be doubted that the US works deeply with scientific ideas, but the dependence on different information is clear. In particular, A. Panarin interprets U. Ashby's idea in an interesting way. According to U. Ashby (William Ross Ashby), the management system should be diverse compared to the managed object system. A. Panarin continues this observation and comes to the following conclusion: management subjects try to simplify the variety of objects managed by them. Simple object management is easy. Therefore, the West has been strengthening the specific type of democracy and market economy in the world, and using them to implement management mechanisms in practical life. That is, Western democracy and the Western market economy are introduced not because they are suitable for the object, but because it is easily controlled by the West. The reason for the economic growth of Asian countries is that they have incorporated national characteristics into the model adopted from the West<sup>9</sup>.

The general strategic movement of the world is understandable in many ways. We have been paying little attention to the analysis of the changes taking place, because we are limited to tactical decision-making. As a result, the right to define the strategy is being transferred to another party. Ignorance of these actions leads to protection from the negative actions of others. This again brings us to the tactical frontier. All winnings will be available only in the strategy drawing (F .X).

It is necessary to imagine the actions of the big players to respond to the modern world influence, because the development of the 21st century depends on them. According to Michael McFool, the US has not put forward clear goals for the second phase after the fight against terrorism, and this goal, in his opinion, should be to strengthen the liberal doctrine. He also analyzes the fight against terrorism and all the wars of the last century.

It is very important for us to know and study such aspirations of the big players because it gives us a chance to predict the actions of the super players. Megamovements by super players cause macro changes. Knowing their direction, we can predict macro changes. By having a better idea of the direction and outcome of these macro rules, we will be able to better direct our steps.

M. Makfull justifies the primacy of the liberal doctrine with the following:

- helps explain the relationship between different political approaches. For example, Saddam Hussein is equated with submission to Afghan women;
- liberal doctrine leads the struggle in ideas, people and systems, but not in the state, because in Iraq and Iran there may be people and groups inclined to liberal doctrine. Therefore, this doctrine allows this struggle to be carried out in terms of ideas;
- liberal doctrine defines a goal that can be supported by states, movements, and individuals that may oppose all U.S. strategic interests but support this goal;

<sup>9</sup> Панарин А.С. Глобальное политическое прогнозирование. -М., 2000. - С. 322-323

□ the liberal doctrine has not only a destructive, but also a constructive phase, therefore it is necessary to increase attention to the constructive aspects, which eliminates the need for constant military operations.

➤ It is necessary to imagine the actions of the big players to respond to the modern world influence, because the development of the 21st century depends on them. According to Michael McFool, the US has not put forward clear goals for the second phase after the fight against terrorism, and this goal, in his opinion, should be to strengthen the liberal doctrine. He also analyzes the fight against terrorism and all the wars of the last century.

➤ It is very important for us to know and study such aspirations of the big players because it gives us a chance to predict the actions of the super players. Megamovements by super players cause macro changes. Knowing their direction, we can predict macro changes. By having a better idea of the direction and outcome of these macro rules, we will be able to better direct our steps.

➤ M. Makfull justifies the primacy of the liberal doctrine with the following:

➤ □ helps explain the relationship between different political approaches. For example, Saddam Hussein is equated with submission to Afghan women;

➤ □ liberal doctrine leads the struggle in ideas, people and systems, but not in the state, because in Iraq and Iran there may be people and groups inclined to liberal doctrine. Therefore, this doctrine allows this struggle to be carried out in terms of ideas;

➤ □ liberal doctrine defines a goal that can be supported by states, movements, and individuals that may oppose all U.S. strategic interests but support this goal;

➤ □ the liberal doctrine has not only a destructive, but also a constructive phase, therefore it is necessary to increase attention to the constructive aspects, which eliminates the need for constant military operations<sup>10</sup>.

As a result, the concept of the enemy is reworked. Osama bin Laden did not claim territory or resources. He is an ideological enemy. They inculcate anti-Western and anti-modern ideology. By understanding the enemy on these terms, the US is saying that it is not fighting a war on terrorism, because terrorism is only a tool, an instrument, a tactic. There is no way to wage war against a tool or a tactic and win. It is important to understand the enemy's motives and motives: the fight against terrorism does not end like the fight against violence. But the war against Islamic totalitarianism and Western democracy can continue until victory.

In his opinion, this situation is similar to the struggle with fascism, or the struggle with communism. As Kevin Kelly wrote in 1995 (out of control) Radical Islam will replace Communism <sup>11</sup> he wrote.

By strengthening democracy in the world, it is possible to ensure economic growth in developing countries. It used to be believed that the first change would come, then

<sup>10</sup> *McFaut M.* The liberty doctrine // Policy review. - 2002. - April. - N 112

<sup>11</sup> *hwartz P.* Terrorism and the challenge to globalization // [www.gbn.org](http://www.gbn.org)

democracy. New evidence suggests that democracy must come with change. Other researchers also consider war as part of political tasks.

M. Ignatieff is considered the founder of the new theory of the USA as an empire. In his view, imperial power dictates the rules of the game for all countries (from the market to weapons of mass destruction), while distancing itself from other rules (eg the Kyoto Protocol, the International Criminal Court).

As an empire, the United States opposes such a name, the former president of the United States, J. Bush Jr., expressed many opinions about it. On the one hand, imperial measures are contrary to the republican system, and on the other hand, in the opinion of the United States, the policy of political containment has reached its highest level<sup>12</sup>.

Former US Vice President Dick Cheney pointed out the shortcomings of these approaches. The strategy of intimidation, which was used effectively during the Cold War, has lost its relevance today. A containment strategy cannot be used against a terrorist witness, and it cannot be used against a country that transfers weapons to a terrorist network. Hussan, Cheney denies that the US depends on other countries in its decision-making process.

Military revolutions lead to new military changes, and from this period, the United States had the opportunity to rise to the status of a new empire. M. Ignatieff considers the political aspects of this revolution more important than the technological ones. Because it was Bush and Clinton who used more military force than Roosevelt, American soldiers became victims of war. But it should also be recognized that the US spends only a small part of its GDP on defense, but other countries cannot spend the same amount on their army and cannot reach the development of military armament that the US has achieved.

According to M. Ignatieff, Great Britain can keep its name in the list of strategic players only if it is a close partner of the USA. Because it has neither a large territory like Russia nor a large population like China. States determine their foreign policy only taking into account the US policy, and Europe does not have such opportunities<sup>13</sup>.

Neil Ferguson, a famous British historian who also works in the US, suggests using the concept of hegemony instead of empire. Great Britain had the opportunity to become such a country after the neo-Paleon uprisings. His colonies in Africa and Asia ensured his position. However, in the middle of the 20th century, it began to lose this status.

A hundred years ago, Britain ruled over a quarter of the world's land mass and about the same amount of the world's population. At that time, Britain was using "soft power", and today the US is using the same method through its multinational corporations. However, Arabs do not like the United States, even if they drink Coca-Cola, smoke bigamy, and listen to Britney Spears. Britain advanced its colonies not

<sup>12</sup> Ignatieff M. The new American way ill war // The New York review of Books. - Vol. 47. - N 12. - 2000. - July 20

<sup>13</sup> Ignatieff M. The new American way ill war // The New York review of Books. - Vol. 47. - N 12. - 2000. - July 20



only through its missionaries and newspaper, but also through sports. Cricket has become popular in India, rugby in the US, and football around the world.

At the same time, N.Ferguson highlights the psychological aspects of power, which he believes can either strengthen or weaken power. Power may be legitimate within the country, but requires recognition abroad. He concludes his article with an interesting conclusion that could serve as an epigraph to any humanities book: "Faith cannot move a mountain, but it can keep a man moving toward it"<sup>14</sup>.

The Empire everywhere interprets itself as the center of the world. Historical China, Great Britain and today's USA are clear examples of this. A country that interprets itself as a world center and instills this in others, both culturally and economically, draws others towards itself. It is embodied as a cultural center. The inculcation of symbolic mini-values is also important in becoming such a center.

АҚШ бугун ҳам кучли ҳарбий инструментарийларга, ҳам кучли рамзий қадриятларга эга. Бу Голивуд асарларидан тортиб, CNN ахборотигача бўлган инструменарийлардир. Улар жаҳон воқеаларини жуда ҳам катта ва кўп миқдорда узатиш, интерпритация қилиш имкониятига эга, бошқа биронта давлат бундай имкониятларга эга эмас.

All of them lead to a change in the world order by the US in recent times. The United States, which has established the right to armed intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, creates opportunities for this intervention and develops a set of special rules.

A new system of war has been embodied in front of us, which gave us the opportunity to predict the behavior of a super player like the USA, which has special aspects. These rules have not been formalized today, but nevertheless they have been used for a long time in history.

In this case, there was a need for a new division of responsibilities: the US would wage war, the French, English, and Germans would act as policemen, and the Dutch, Swiss, and Scandinavians would provide humanitarian aid.

M. McFull names the International Bank, the Peace Corps, Radio Free Europe as non-military components of the new war. They also feel the need for reforms and re-reforms. The U.S. uses a non-military strategy to widely promote its ideas in the Islamic world, and it has and is using information about which Islamic leaders it can and cannot work with.

The requirement to determine priorities was brought forward, because it is impossible to work in all directions at once.

It should be noted that foreign policy has become more important than ever before in the US presidential elections. J. Mann followed the foreign policy priorities of the former US president J. Bush, and in the last 90 years of the 20th century, representatives of the 4 presidential terms - representatives of the Republican

<sup>14</sup> Ferguson N. Hegemony or empire? // Foreign Affairs. - 2013. -September - October

administration met every three months and determined the foreign policy. Cheney, Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz were invited to these meetings.

It was there that North Korea, China, Russia and Iraq were studied as objects.

Geopolitical statics are known historically, less attention is paid to geopolitical dynamics, but it is precisely tactics that have practical aspects.

Within the geopolitical border, a new version of geopolitical dynamics has been formed, which reveals a change in relations. Based on it, it is possible to predict the course of situations. For example, Randall Collins from the University of Pennsylvania predicted the collapse of the Soviet Union in his time, and this prediction came true after a long time. Modern Theory of Geopolitical Dynamics: Reconstruction of R.Collins Research Program. Some observations of R. Collins clearly illuminate several types of dependence today. For example, the following principle proves it: the legitimacy of power is directly related to its position/achievements in the field of foreign policy. Let's remember how L. Brezhnev and M. Gorbachev depended on the words spoken from outside. This situation was related to the crisis of the foreign policy of the USSR.

According to G. Derlugyan, the Soviet Union was destroyed because it could not adapt to the processes of globalization. According to the author, at the same time, the Soviet Union had to compete with the Western economy, political, social life and ideological direction, while the USA had great advantages in these directions. Competition with a country with huge potential has led to a sad situation. The process of globalization invites all countries to compete with each other, and this competition is carried out outside the military sphere, no country can keep itself out of this competition. Whether he wants it or not, everyone has to mobilize himself in the process of globalization. Comparing and contrasting in the virtual space makes the competition even more active<sup>15</sup>.

In one of his interviews, R. Collins cites the revolution of 1917 as an example: the peculiarity of the situation at that time is that it led to a real change in the macrostructure, but its participants looked at this situation as a macro situation. That is, no one understands its consequences<sup>16</sup> didn't know that. Not everyone paid attention to strategic changes because they were busy with tactical actions. At the tactical level, strategic results cannot be seen.

I. Wallerstein believes that the world has not been able to restore order since 1968. In this year, according to him, the revolution took place, in 1970-1990 there was a period of economic stagnation. Whether these approaches are right or wrong can be debated at length. But it must be admitted that serious changes have taken place in the world, but the closer they are to the present, the more difficult it is to unravel them.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Дерлугян Г. Крушение советской системы и его потенциальные следствия: банкротство, сегментация, вырождение// Полис. 2000. №2

<sup>16</sup> Collins{ulerview// [www.ssc.wisc.edu](http://www.ssc.wisc.edu)

<sup>17</sup> Валлерстайн И. После либерализма. -, 2003

Geopolitical statics change to dynamics only in certain cases, and revolution does not correspond to this condition. Because this or that country's adherence to this or that geopolitical standard is not determined by the change of the political system.

The dynamics can be observed in two main cases:

- universal tendencies to overcome the contradiction within the existing dichotomy;
- the point of difference between civilizations, in this case artificially defining one country as belonging to another civilization and creating the opportunity to use its resources.

In crisis situations, all problems come to the fore, if previously resources were used to prevent them, this time the resources are limited or the mechanism of their use is outdated or levers have been lost.

According to A. Panarin, the geopolitical conflict is becoming more active. One of his main works is called "Contendence of the Next Hundred Years: Continental Rematch". He writes: "The continent lives in a completely different space-time: it is impossible to emigrate from this space, because long-term conclusions are more important than short-term conclusions"<sup>18</sup>.

He continued: "The continent must create a different time machine, use a different process of sorting cultural material." "Short proposals" and the technique of sorting texts should be replaced by the methodology of working with "long texts", because it is they who preserve long-term cultural and moral signs. Russia and India, located in the vertical section of Indo-Europe, are the regions rich in such "long texts". It's an interesting proposal, but the deadline for their implementation is still ahead. The US also lives in the realm of "short texts" and has recently been intensifying its research efforts to create a culture with "long texts"<sup>19</sup>.

A. Dugin summarizes geopolitics and treats it as a management science<sup>20</sup>.

The transition to one or another development option is carried out on the basis of geopolitical elements, the strategy operates in many areas, it is interested not only in geopolitical factors, but also in many other factors. However, geopolitical factors are an important factor and have stabilizing elements in the world.

## Conclusion

Among the political services, the most important is security. Other services may be provided only when security is ensured. Weak states can easily slip into a failed state. Among the developing countries, the number of such countries in the list is several decades. Internal struggle is important, but it is not essential to join the ranks of fallen states. Antagonism has led to violence in countries where the angle has fallen. A civil war cannot be the reason for the decline. Sri Lanka, Colombia, Indonesia are examples

<sup>18</sup> Панарин А.С. Глобальное политическое прогнозирование. - М., 2000

<sup>19</sup> Панарин А.С. Глобальное политическое прогнозирование. - М., 2000

<sup>20</sup> Дугин А. Основы геополитики. Геополитическое будущее России. Мыслить пространством. М.2012. С.14

of this. The provision of political services in these countries in the required volume and quality will stop their decline.

### Conclusion/Recommendations

In the modern world, old methods and methods have lost their effectiveness to ensure a stable situation. It is also related to not knowing the level of risks, not being able to apply the right methods to them. It should not be overlooked that small causes have serious consequences. Older systems can focus well on large impacts and take effective action against or enabling them, but small causes are beyond their control.

### Literature

1. Geopolitics, geography, and strategy / editors, Colin S. Gray, Geoffrey Sloan. Copyright © 1999 Taylor & Francis. P 127
2. Гаджиев К.С. Геополитика. – М., 2007.-С.31
3. <sup>1</sup> Гаджиев К.С. Введение в геополитику. – М., 2008. –С.59
4. <sup>1</sup> Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций. М. 2003
5. <sup>1</sup> Иванов Л.Г. Россия или Московия? Геополитическое измерение национальной безопасности России. М. 2010
6. <sup>1</sup> Савицкий П. Контингент Евразия. М., 1997
7. <sup>1</sup> Ignatieff M. The attack on human rights // Foreign Allans. - 2001. - November - December; Игнатъефф М. Многообразие // www.internews.ru
8. <sup>1</sup> Панарин А.С. Глобальное политическое прогнозирование. М. 2010. С. 322-323
9. <sup>1</sup> Панарин А.С. Глобальное политическое прогнозирование. -М., 2000. - С. 322-323
10. <sup>1</sup> McFaut M. The liberty doctrine // Policy review. - 2002. - April. - N 112
11. <sup>1</sup> hwartz P. Terrorism and the challenge to globalization // www.gbn.org)
12. <sup>1</sup> Ignatieff M. The new American way ill war // The New York review of Books. - Vol. 47. - N 12. - 2000. - July 20