

**THE HISTORY OF WAR AND ITS PLACE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL
CONSCIOUSNESS**

Shaymanov Fozilbek To'liqin o'g'li

Termiz State Pedagogical
Institute Philosophy and
foundations of spirituality
teacher of the department

Abstract: This article discusses the history of war and its positive and negative effects on the development of social consciousness. Opinions were expressed about the tasks facing the world community in preventing war.

Keywords: War, peace, ideology, social consciousness, existence, hostility.

Humanity has faced various problems since its inception. Some of these problems arose naturally, that is, independent of humans, while some of them arose directly among humans. The problems created by mankind should be called anthropogenic problems. War is the most dangerous of the human-made problems. Wars in human history have cost millions of lives. No matter how many times a society goes through war, people can't learn enough from wars, and as long as there are people, this phenomenon will continue. History has not prevented wars. Despite the very painful experiences of war, humanity hopes for a world without war. Although the world has experienced periods of war, there have also been decades of peace. Therefore, the goal of achieving peace is not a utopia [Page James S. (2000).].

Uzbek people always say «Your neighbor is peaceful - you are peaceful» he lives according to the tradition. This means that the denial of war is a characteristic value of the people. War has not always brought good to people. The author O. Hoshimov, who has written many works on the topic of war, comments on this: «In war, a victorious and happy king, a victorious and happy army, a victorious and happy state, there can be a winning and happy regime. But there will be no winner and happy person. After all, war forces people to kill people. A person who kills a person will never be happy!» [O'tkir Hashimov (2018)].

The Russian writer Tolstoy could not find a logical answer in his inner world about the causes of wars that caused great suffering to mankind. Tolstoy thought for a long time about the causes of the war, which led to the death of five hundred thousand people during Napoleon's siege of Russia, and finally came to the following conclusion:

«Why are millions of people killing each other, when killing has been known to be physically and morally bad since the beginning of the world?» And so it was inevitably necessary that the men who did it applied the zoological law of nature, which causes the male animals to destroy each other, as the bees do by destroying each other in the fall. There can be no other answer to this terrible question" [Harris, Ian. (2010).]. As a historical term, «war» has been given various definitions. The National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan defines war as follows: «War is the settlement of conflicts between social groups, nations (peoples), states by force, usually with the help of armed forces. Armed forces, as well as economic, political, ideological and other means of struggle are used as the main and decisive means of war. Wars are the result of domestic and foreign policies conducted by states» [<https://uz.wikipedia.org/wiki/Urush>]. War is an organized struggle used by the parties to break the will of hostile forces and to dominate their own will.

According to Clausewitz, war is the continuation of politics by other means. Clausewitz also discussed the nature of war as art and science, saying, «War is neither art nor science; It is part of

social life. He concludes: «This is a conflict of great interests resolved in blood» [Clausewitz, Carl Von. (1984).].

A war is an armed conflict started by two or more states and desired by at least one state or organized by international organizations against one or more states.

Ibn Khaldun said that ever since tribes appeared on earth and god created humans, war and murder have continued, and he said that wars have four causes. Accordingly, the first reason is the feeling of revenge, the second reason is hostility, the third reason is the idea of serving god and religion, the fourth reason is the defensive action of states against those who rebel against them and those who do not obey the government. [Khaldun Ibn. (1989).]

The causes of wars change over time. War can be caused by many factors, such as land, protection of co-religionists, national liberation, unification, colonization, support of allies, regional dominance, acceptance of terms of agreement, protection of trade.

Wars can also be fueled by imperialist ambitions and the highly profitable arms industry. In addition, heads of state who adopt expansionist ambitions as a principle can also lead to war. Currently, access to energy sources is one of the most important reasons for wars. In addition, civil wars can occur for ethnic and religious reasons. Wars in the 21st century are limited between nations, and ethnic conflicts have increased within states.

According to Mustafa Kamal, who attached importance to the «defense» aspect of the war, defending the homeland is a very noble duty. He argues that wars are justified only when people are forced to defend their homeland: «I am definitely not in favor of dragging people into war for one reason or another. War must be necessary and vital, my correct opinion is this: I should not feel any pangs of conscience when I lead the people to war. We can go to war saying «We will not die» against those who say «We will kill». But if the life of the nation is not at stake, war is murder». [Atatürkçülük. (1983).

According to these views, the economy is a decisive factor in wars. But it should be added that the fact that economic history began to gain power over political history does not diminish the importance of wars. War has as much to do with politics as it does with economics. Just as economic factors affect the outbreak of wars, wars also affect the economy in some way. In addition, the impact of wars on human values and national education and the importance of wars have been neglected by researchers. Although the Turkish ruler also spoke about wars: «I resurrected and straightened a nation that wanted to die, clothed a naked nation, made a poor one rich, and made a small nation numerous.» , he said. With this word, he shows that he thinks about his nation before himself and explains the basic reason of his struggle without any feeling of enmity.[Temir Ahmet. (1964-1965).]

The attempt to categorize war as biological fails not only in the failure to distinguish between the social and biological aspects of war, but also in the failure to distinguish between competition and conflict, and the various aspects of the «struggle for existence.» Competition can be viewed as an individual or analytical process. Wars, at least for collective action, necessitated the organization of a society incomparably superior to the primitive herd. The state not only arose from war, but its main task is still to prepare for war and conduct it.

In the absence of common interests or «constitutional understandings» for compromise, wars seem inevitable. Ideological wars become a struggle for land, because political control and territorial sovereignty are necessary to preserve the different ways of life represented by the participants in these conflicts. The task of war:

First, to expand the area of peace;

Secondly, to create a political force capable of implementing it in this area;

The third is the introduction of a culture that rationalizes, ideologies and idealizes the new political and social order.

As a military dimension of a certain social and political structure, the organization and social roles of troops are closely related to the environment in which they exist. Armies both feed on this environment and contribute to its growth. From this point of view, as the state and society develop over time, so do the armies. At any moment in history, this trinity - state, society and military - interacts with each other.

One of the most important directions in the process of forming a modern state is the army, war and other security operations.

Historically, wars and security practices have established the modern state and restructured political power in ways that were centralized and not always intended. In this regard, the main structural features of the modern state with war, army and security practices, there is a direct connection between its institutional architecture and the process of building state apparatuses, constituting power relations and the influence of the state on these relations.

In this regard, it is emphasized that war, or preparation for war in general, is one of the important factors in the formation of national states and the centralization of the state. Because the technology of war and the change in its nature and size changed the political and economic relations between the rulers and the society. There is a direct relationship between war and the ability of the state to collect taxes, between war and bureaucratization, and between war and technological change. Analysts say that the need for institutional regulation in various areas where states try to generate the money and human resources needed to maintain an army and wage wars expands the state's sphere of influence and increases its social visibility. To understand this effect, one can use as an example the system of conscription (citizen armies) that became the main method of warfare throughout Europe in the 19th century.

This new type of army required regular population registration and monitoring, which had not been considered before. Because the population to be recruited should be identified and controlled centrally and institutionalized in a certain manner. For the first time in history, the establishment of the population census and civil registry offices stems from this need. Immediately, there was a need for both legal and physical sanctioning power and various mechanisms of persuasion and consent to mobilize this population.

Moreover, raising the financial resources necessary to wage these large-scale wars required an increasingly formalized economy and a large portion of the population contributing to the state budget through taxes. [Ames, E., Rapp, R. (1977).]

The reshaped tax collection capacity after the war affected the size of state institutions, the relationship between society and institutions, and the shape of the state.

In other words, the change in the nature of war and the new military organizations it created, despite all their destructive effects, led to an increase in the state's ability to penetrate society and infrastructural power.

From this point of view, the process of waging war and the formation of security devices that control this process are the founders of modern state formation [Desch, M. (1996).]

Although the destructiveness of war discourse has increased in the global world, its credibility has decreased, and with the introduction of concepts such as human security and social security into the security literature, the irrationality of war has caused it to lose its rhetorical power.

In the new era, the lines of difference between warring forces and non-combatant groups are gradually disappearing. The burden of war fell on civilians. Civilians are now both victims and targets. Only territorial states have effective political and military power. Instead of supporting this position, the new wars undermine the image of the state by complicating the relationship between war and peace and increase the sense of distrust in societies.

References:

1. Ames, E., Rapp, R. (1977). "The Birth and Death of the Taxes: A Hypothesis", *Journal of Economic History*, (37): 161-178.
2. Atatürkçülük. (1983). Genel Kurmay Basımevi, Ankara ATA, B (1999). "Çanakkale Savaşlarını Nasıl Öğreteceğiz?", *Türk Yurdu*, 164, Ankara, 23-29
3. Clausewitz, Carl Von. (1984). Harp Üzerine, Birinci Cilt, Çev. H Fahri Çeliker, Genel Kurmay Basımevi, Ankara 109-b.
4. Desch, M. (1996). "War and Strong States, Peace and Weak States?", *International Organization*, 50(2): 237-268
5. Haldun İbn. (1989). Mukaddime II, (çeviren: Zakir Kadiri Urgan), Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, İstanbul.38-b.
6. Harris, Ian. (2010). "History of peace education", *Handbook on Peace Education*, Edited by Gavriel Salomon and Edward Cairns, Psychology Press, 11-20.
7. Page James S. (2000). "Can History teach us peace", *Peace Review*, 441-448.
8. Temir Ahmet. (1964-1965). "Eski Türk Yazıtlarında Savaş Tasvirleri", *Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü*, Sayı 25-36, Yıl 3, 642-646.
9. Ҳошимов, Ўткир Дафтар хошиясидаги битиклар. Ўткир Ҳошимов. - Тошкент: Янги аср авлоди, 2018. - 240 б.
10. Раҳманкулов, Ф. (2022). Глобаллашув жараёнида миллий ўзликни асраш масалалари. *Евразийский журнал социальных наук, философии и культуры*, 2(11), 35-39.
11. Ikromovich, P. X. (2023). Jadid ma'rifatparvarchiligi shakllanishidagi tarixiy shart-sharoit va obektiv zaruriyat. *Finland International Scientific Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities*, 11(3), 167-179
12. <https://uz.wikipedia.org/wiki/Urush>