

THE DIPLOMATIC ACTIVITIES OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT IN THE ROLE OF CULTURAL RAPPROCHEMENT BETWEEN THE WEST AND THE EAST

Juliboyev Alimardon Abdulmajidovich

The student of the Kokand SPI, History faculty

Annotation:

The article highlights that Alexander created the public opinion he needed through diplomatic means; used the struggle of various party groups to achieve his goal; separated the forces and opposition that rebelled against him. He also demonstrated his diplomatic skill in political and religious demonstrations; in diplomatic games both with one's own army and with the conquered population; in pursuing a subtle policy of relations with defeated countries and peoples.

Keywords: Alexander the Great, diplomacy, Philip II, Asia Minor, Diodotus, Plutarch, Miletus, Halicarnassus, Phrygia

As you know, war almost always accompanied Alexander's foreign policy. Of the 13 years of his reign, there was virtually not a single year of peace. This situation naturally overshadowed diplomatic actions, which were the means of implementing foreign policy and its practical implementation. It was difficult for diplomacy to compete with the glory of Alexander's famous military victories. Unlike the latter, diplomatic actions did not cause a corresponding resonance. Perhaps this explains the fact that Alexander's diplomatic activities have not yet received adequate coverage.

In acquiring diplomatic skills, the first teacher of the "great conqueror" was his father Philip II, the king of Macedonia, a talented statesman, commander and diplomat. From a young age, he taught his son to understand the meaning of diplomacy and the hidden mystery of diplomatic actions, the flexibility of diplomatic practice, the moral principles and norms of this complex type of human activity. Alexander saw what diplomatic methods his father used when concluding treaties that he did not comply with; the promises he made to the Greeks in order to gain time; the resourceful cunning with which he separated Greek cities, sowed treason in the ranks of his opponents, making extensive use of bribery; supported friends,



won over those who were wavering to his side, and deceived the enemy without a twinge of conscience 3. Under the influence of such actions, Alexander showed diplomatic abilities quite early.

He was a talented student of his no less talented father, and in the process of his eastern campaigns he was able to increase his knowledge, acquiring new forms and methods of diplomatic art, in accordance with the new tasks that current events confronted him with¹.

Plutarch reports how, in the absence of Philip, the very young Alexander had to receive the Persian ambassadors himself. He made friends with them and won them over with his courtesy and questions, in which there was nothing childish or empty. However, for all his outward peacefulness, his diplomacy was based on a real military force of intimidation - the Macedonian army. The Theban defeat is clear proof of this. But even here Alexander was extremely careful, trying to show the Greeks that he stood for justice. He demanded from the Athenians to hand over those 10 speakers who acted against him (Diod. XVII. 15. 1.), but invited the Greeks to decide the fate of Thebes themselves. To please him, they passed a cruel sentence: the inhabitants of the city were sold into slavery, and the city was completely destroyed.

In carrying out these plans, Alexander made extensive use not only of weapons, but also of all the diplomatic means at his disposal. In his arsenal, first of all, was the formation of public opinion, the separation of potential enemies, intimidation and punishment of the disobedient. Alexander's diplomacy towards the Greek cities of Asia Minor is regarded by the main sources as their "liberation" from Achaemenid rule. Alexander destroyed the oligarchy everywhere and restored democratic rule, allowed the townspeople to live according to their laws, and removed the taxes that they paid to the Persians. It cannot be said that Alexander's Panhellenic propaganda and diplomacy were completely successful here. Some large cities, like Miletus and Halicarnassus, realized their true goals. Macedonian commander, did not succumb to his diplomatic tricks and put up decisive resistance. In such cases, Alexander refused diplomatic cover, forgot about the slogan of liberation and unification of the Greeks of Asia Minor and took the cities by storm. Panhellenism could not in all cases be the main link in Alexander's political strategy. Reality often forced us to change positions and be guided by other diplomatic considerations. Thus, Alexander spared

¹ Гафуров Б.Г., Цибукидис Д.И. Александр Македонский и Восток. М., 1980 стр.87.



the inhabitants of Miletus who were captured by him, thereby emphasizing his commitment to Panhellenic ideas, but this did not stop him from razing Halicarnassus to the ground. If after the battle of Granicus Alexander captured Greek mercenaries and sent them in chains to work in Macedonia as traitors who fought on the side of the Persians (Hag. I. 16. 6), then after the capture of Miletus he spared 300 mercenaries and included them in the of his army.

In the conditions of Asia Minor, diplomatic activity could not but undergo significant changes. Small concessions, promises and similar techniques, widely used in Greece, are almost never used in Asia Minor. Alexander openly switched to diplomacy from a position of strength. The cities of Asia Minor could now count on Alexander's favor only if they sent him representative embassies with rich gifts and were ready to make peace with him on his terms. But the agreement on "friendship" did not recognize their complete freedom and was associated with some restrictions on their independence. An example of this is the embassy of the Phaselites, which awarded Alexander a golden crown and asked him for friendship. The latter ordered them, like the Lycians, to send their cities to those whom he would send to them (Hag. 24.6). All the cities were surrendered. Alexander ordered the Paphlogonians, who voluntarily surrendered and asked not to send troops into their lands, to be subordinated to Kalat, the satrap of Phrygia (Hag. II, 4. 1-2). Curtius reports that the king even took hostages from them (III. 1. 23). These actions of Alexander clearly demonstrate the desire to subjugate the occupied territories and strengthen his power over them².

If the population of Asia Minor cities and regions tried to go beyond the boundaries defined by Alexander's diplomatic demands, severe punishment awaited them. According to Arrian, Alexander's diplomacy in such cases played an important role in maintaining his political authority. In fact, Alexander's diplomacy is full of examples of subtle and flexible maneuvering, based on deft demagoguery, concessions and false promises, the ability to conclude profitable treaties and alliances, the ability to separate opponents, and create the public opinion necessary for one's goals. Moreover, during the eastern expedition, Alexander's diplomatic activities developed, changed, and improved. It was different before the start of the eastern campaign, when Alexander first of all sought and achieved through

² Зельин К.К. Основные черты эллинизма.- ВДЙ, 1903, 4 стр.43.



diplomatic means the creation of conditions for the implementation of his father's idea of a campaign to the East.

Conclusion. Thus, we can say with confidence that Alexander's diplomacy was an important means of solving the foreign policy problems that confronted him. It acted, as a rule, in close cooperation with military measures and most often served to consolidate and approve the results achieved through military means. Alexander's diplomatic activity not only contributed to the policy of economic, political and cultural rapprochement between the West and the East, but was part of this policy. Therefore, in the process of establishing a new Hellenistic order, Alexander's diplomacy played a significant role. We will consider the remaining issues within the framework of a unified approach.

REFERENCES:

1. Дройзен И. История эллинизма. Т - I, Ростов-на-Дону, 1993.стр 29.
2. Шахермайер Ф. Александр Македонский. М., 1999.стр. 57.
3. Гафуров Б.Г., Цибукидис Д.И. Александр Македонский и Восток. М., 1980 стр.87.
4. Radet G. Alexandre le Grand. Paris, 1931.стр.45.
5. Гафуров Б.Г., Цибукидао Д.Й.Указ» соч.,с.12.
6. Зельин К.К.Основные черты эллинизма.- ВДЙ,1903,4