

# SOCIAL-IDEATOLOGICAL ESSENCE OF THE PHENOMENON OF WAR IN THE MODERN PERIOD

**Shaymanov F.T.**

National University of Uzbekistan

1st year independent researcher

**Abstract:** This article emphasizes that the socio-ideological essence of the phenomenon of war in the modern era is closely related to the development of society, global political processes and the development of information and communication technologies. It is revealed that modern wars are waged not only through military conflict, but also through ideological struggle, information influence, propaganda and psychological pressure. It also sheds light on the ideological interpretations of the phenomenon of war as a complex socio-ideological phenomenon that affects the consciousness of society, social values and political views.

**Keywords:** phenomenon of war, political and hybrid wars, information manipulation, ideological narratives, the concept of "eternal peace", information war.

## **Introduction**

In contemporary conditions, the concept of war has expanded and is no longer limited solely to armed confrontation. Information, economic, political, and hybrid forms of warfare reveal the new face of war. However, in all its forms the essence of war remains unchanged: it is a process aimed at resolving social contradictions through the use of force or coercive pressure. At the same time, the expansion of the concept of war in modern conditions does not mean that its essence has changed; rather, it indicates that its forms of manifestation have become more complex.

Beyond armed confrontation, the emergence of information, economic, political, and hybrid wars indicates that conflicts between societies are now conducted not only on the military battlefield, but also within the spheres of consciousness, markets, institutions, and communication. Nevertheless, the internal content of war remains stable: it is a process directed at resolving social contradictions through coercion, pressure, and force. The concept of “force,” however, has broadened to include not only physical violence but also informational manipulation, economic pressure, and political destabilization.

In studying the phenomenon of war, a multi-level and interdisciplinary methodology is of great importance. A socio-philosophical and methodological analysis of the war phenomenon helps to understand its complex, dynamic, and multidimensional nature. In particular, the historical method makes it possible to analyze the emergence and development of wars within specific conditions. The systemic and structural approach helps to view war as the interaction of political, economic, informational, and cultural factors. The dialectical method reveals the contradictions between war and peace, violence and justice. Normative-ethical analysis evaluates the legitimacy of war within the frameworks of just war theory, international law, and human rights. In modern conditions, discursive and critical approaches are also significant, as they analyze ideological narratives about war and the role of information warfare

**Main Part.** In the context of modern globalization, when the forms and manifestations of war are continuously changing, referring to its classical philosophical interpretations acquires significant theoretical and practical importance. Classical heritage provides an opportunity to understand more deeply the essence of war, the factors behind its emergence, and its impact on human civilization. From this perspective, the main objective of this study is to systematically analyze the classical philosophical interpretations of the concept of war and to reveal its key philosophical aspects.

Indeed, the American philosopher S. Huntington, while examining the principles of modern warfare, argues that ideologically determined military actions between states are gradually being replaced by clashes between civilizations. At the same time, S. Huntington notes: “In this new world, the most widespread, important, and dangerous conflicts will not occur between social classes, the rich and the poor, but between peoples belonging to different cultural identities... And the most dangerous cultural conflicts will occur along the fault lines between civilizations (ХАНТИНГТОН С. 2003. – С. 24-25.). He writes that the spread of Western culture into other societies may lead to serious consequences. Naturally, this point of view was not received with enthusiasm. A number of works critically assessing S. Huntington’s position appeared, including in Russia. For instance, B. I. Kaverin emphasizes that, according to S.Huntington, wars between states and their allies do not really exist as independent phenomena, since they are regarded as elements of conflicts between civilizations. According to B. I. Kaverin, S. Huntington “uses such concepts as ‘culture,’ ‘civilization,’ ‘war,’ and ‘military conflict’ rather freely (КАВЕРИН Б.И. 2008. – С. 106.). However, in one way or another, S. Huntington’s ideas significantly influenced the formation of the image of war: “bloody” wars have increasingly been replaced by “bloodless” wars, where objectives are achieved not through the direct use of military force but through other instruments of pressure such as economic, political, psychological, informational, energy-based, and other forms.

It should be emphasized that modern society possesses an unprecedented capacity to generate risks. The emergence of new subjects of war - transnational organizations such as the UN, NATO, BRICS, and OPEC, whose roles are connected with the implementation of certain common missions - has altered the nature of war. These international-level organizations may legitimize military violence, which in turn leads to the emergence of what is often called “peacekeeping war.” Within this framework, the use of military violence,

including armed force, is permitted in order to establish and maintain peace within the territory of a military conflict. “The emergence of subjects of war that are not directly linked to a particular state is inseparable from global processes. The function of these organizations lies in the transition from a system centered on the nation-state—where the state fully controls its borders and territory - to a new system in which territorially distinct states gradually disperse and evolve toward trans-territorial, non-state formations.” (Шакирова Е.Ю., Герасимов Н.Н. 2016. – С. 300.). In our view, this process compels humanity to consider not only national interests but also global stability and security. It also demonstrates that the meaning and scope of war are undergoing fundamental changes. Indeed, war is no longer merely a territorial or national conflict; rather, it has become a phenomenon that concerns entire civilizations and global systems.

**Methods.** The modern (non-classical) interpretation of war is associated with its changing status as a social phenomenon. In the works of philosophers such as M. Kaldor (Калдор М. 2016. – С. 412), M. van Creveld, A. Toffler, and H. Toffler, the specific socio-philosophical aspects of war are explored and analyzed. In particular, according to M. van Creveld, “war is a distinct type of human activity closely connected with culture.” (Кревельд М. 2015. – С. 320.). For A. Toffler, war represents a form of production activity that mirrors the stages of economic development and largely emerges under the influence of the same factors. L. L. Stouffer (Штоффер Л.Л. 2009. – С. 26.) L. L. Stouffer draws attention to the fact that globalization is generating new subjects of military violence beyond states and giving rise to new forms of war, including non-armed ones.

The era of globalization has a significant impact on the transformation of the phenomenon of war. In this context, the destructive forces of the world that oppose universalistic and particularistic concepts and ideas, as well as liberal and conservative priorities and values, are becoming increasingly active. As a

result, S. Huntington argues that this process leads to the emergence of a clash of civilizations. (ХАНТИНГТОН С. 2006. – С. 571.) This is supported by D.A.Anikin, S.A. Danilov, and M.O.Orlov (Орлов М.О., Данилов С.А., АНИКИН Д.А. 2008. – С. 32-38.), Scholars such as V. G. Fedotova and L. L. Stouffer have examined the conditions that give rise to international terrorism. D. Franklin and D. Andrews analyzed economic warfare as a form of conflict between states, which in turn creates favorable conditions within competitive antagonisms.

Philosophers of the CIS such as N.A.Berdyayev, I. A.Ilyin, A.A.Kersnovsky, A.A.Svechin, A.E.Snesarev, V.S.Solovyov, E.N.Trubetskoy, S.L.Frank, and A.S.Khomyakov paid particular attention to the spiritual and ethical components of war, contributing significantly to the formation of its classical type.

**Analysis and Results.** Indeed, the phenomenon of war is one of the oldest events in human history, so deeply intertwined with it that imagining human society without it is difficult. The works of Frederick II, Immanuel Kant, Johann Gottfried Herder, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Carl Philipp Gottlieb von Clausewitz, and others include numerous treatises dedicated to “perpetual peace” and the problems of war and peace.

German authors demonstrated diverse approaches to the problem of war and peace. Some adhered to the view that historical progress inevitably leads to universal peace, while others emphasized the inevitability of wars and conflicts. Particular attention should be given to the perspectives of German philosopher X. Hofmeister and Norwegian philosopher H. Sise, as well as Russian philosophical scholars A. V. Ivanov and A. D. Kumankov. For example, X. Hofmeister (Хофмайстер Х. 2006. – С. 288.) He argued in detail that war today is no longer merely a tool of politics, but rather signifies its rejection. According to H. Sise, “a just war must be waged for the sake of peace and humanity” (Сисе Х. 2007. – С. 176.). A.D.Kumankov (Куманьков А.Д. 2016. – С. 200.) He

emphasized that introducing new moral justifications for war does not lead to their limitation, but rather produces the exact opposite effect.

In the 20th century, humanity looked to the future with confidence, social development prospects were viewed optimistically, and people were fascinated by remarkable achievements in science and production. Today, however, as the social and cultural consequences of progressive development have come to the forefront, optimistic thinking has been replaced by pessimistic terminology, setting a completely different perspective on the nature of socio-cultural progress. This indicates that humanity must approach development responsibly, considering not only technological or economic outcomes but also its cultural, ethical, and social consequences.

**Conclusion.** In conclusion, the phenomenon of war in modern society always possesses an economic component. At the same time, war as a social phenomenon is fundamentally impossible without its economic dimension. Globalization has also given rise to a distinct type of war-economic war-where a particular form of violence is linked to the production and distribution of material resources. The production, justification, and legalization of war become a force that affects the lifestyle of the entire society; in other words, globalization integrates war not only into the battlefield but also into everyday life, culture, and political decision-making. This gives rise to new, extensive, and complex forms of war, while also compelling humanity to reconsider its activities and moral responsibilities on a global scale.

### **References / Bibliography:**

1. Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций. – М.: ООО «Издательство АСТ», 2003. – С. 24-25.
2. Каверин Б.И. Цивилизационная концепция войны и армия // Военно-философский вестник. – М.: 2008. – № 1. – С. 106.
3. Шакирова Е.Ю., Герасимов Н.Н. Изменение дискурса войны в

современном социокультурном пространстве // Известия Саратовского университета. Новая серия. Философия. Психология. Педагогика. 2016. – Т. 16. Вып. 3. – С. 300.

4. Калдор М. Новые и старые войны: Организованное насилие в глобальную эпоху. – М.: Изд-во Института Гайдара, 2016. – С. 412.

5. Кревельд М. Трансформация войны. – М.: ИРИСЭН, Социум, 2015. – С. 320.

6. Штофер Л.Л. Трансформация войны и ее социальные детерминанты в эпоху глобализации: автореф. дис. ... канд. филос. наук. – Ростов-на-Дону, 2009. – С. 26.

7. Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций. – М.: АСТ МОСКВА, 2006. – С. 571.

8. Орлов М.О., Данилов С.А., Аникин Д.А. Исламский терроризм в глобальном мире: социально-философский анализ // Вестник Томского государственного университета. 2008. – С. 32-38.

9. Хофмайстер Х. Воля к войне, или Бессилие политики. Философско-политический трактат. – СПб.: ИЦ «Гуманитарная Академия», 2006. – С. 288.

10. Сисе Х. Справедливая война? О военной мощи, этике и идеалах. – М.: Издательство «Весь Мир», 2007. – С. 176.

11. Куманьков А.Д. Принцип правого дела и «новые» войны // Этика войны и мира: история и перспективы исследования. – СПб.: Алетейя, 2016. – С. 200.