

NAMANGAN DAVLAT
UNIVERSITETI
ILMIY AXBOROTNOMASI, [2026-1]
ISSN:2181-1458
ISSN:2181-0427



09.00.00-FALSAFA
journal.namdu.uz
PHILOSOPHICAL

Ergashev Tursunboy Ilkhomjonovich

Independent researcher of the National University of Uzbekistan

Email: ergashevbahodir44@gmail.com

MILITARY CULTURE OF YOUTH AS AN ELEMENT OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE

Abstract: In the context of increasing global instability, hybrid threats, and transformation of value systems, the issue of military culture among youth acquires particular philosophical and socio-political significance. Military culture, understood not merely as a system of military knowledge and skills, but as a complex of moral values, civic responsibility, historical consciousness, and readiness for social service, becomes an essential element of sustainable state development. This article examines the military culture of youth as a structural component of the philosophy of social sustainable development. The research substantiates that a mature military culture contributes to social cohesion, national resilience, continuity of statehood, and the formation of responsible citizenship.

Keywords: military culture, youth, sustainable development, social philosophy, national security, civic identity, state resilience.

Ergashev Tursunboy Ilkhomjonovich

O'zbekiston Milliy universiteti mustaqil izlanuvchisi

YOSHLAR HARBIY MADANIYATI ELEMENTI SIFATIDA DAVLATNING IJTIMOY BAQARAR RIVOJLANISH FALSAFASI.

Annotatsiya: Global beqarorlikning kuchayishi, gibridd tahdidlar va qadriyatlar tizimidagi o'zgarishlar sharoitida yoshlar o'rtasida harbiy madaniyat masalasi alohida falsafiy va ijtimoiy-siyosiy ahamiyatga ega. Harbiy madaniyat deganda nafaqat harbiy bilim va malakalar tizimi, balki ma'naviy qadriyatlar, fuqarolik mas'uliyati, tarixiy ong va ijtimoiy xizmatga tayyorlik majmui tushuniladi va davlat barqaror rivojlanishining muhim elementiga aylanadi. Ushbu maqolada yoshlarning harbiy madaniyati ijtimoiy barqaror rivojlanish falsafasining tarkibiy qismi sifatida ko'rib chiqiladi. Harbiy madaniyatning etukligi jamiyat hamjihatligi, milliy barqarorlik, davlatchilik barqarorligi, fuqarolik mas'uliyati tuyg'usini shakllantirishga xizmat qilishini tadqiqotlar tasdiqlaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: harbiy madaniyat, yoshlar, barqaror rivojlanish, ijtimoiy falsafa, milliy xavfsizlik, fuqarolik o'ziga xosligi, davlat barqarorligi. Introduction

Эргашев Турсунбой Ильхомжонович

Независимый исследователь Национального университета Узбекистана

МОЛОДЕЖЬ КАК ЭЛЕМЕНТ ВОЕННОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ: ФИЛОСОФИЯ СОЦИАЛЬНО-УСТОЙЧИВОГО РАЗВИТИЯ ГОСУДАРСТВА.

Аннотация: В условиях растущей глобальной нестабильности, гибридных угроз и изменений в системе ценностей вопрос военной культуры среди молодежи приобретает особое философское и социально-политическое значение. Военная культура понимается не только как система военных знаний и навыков, но и как совокупность духовных ценностей, гражданской ответственности, исторического сознания и готовности к общественному служению, становясь важным элементом устойчивого развития государства. В данной статье рассматривается военная культура молодежи как составляющая философии социально-устойчивого развития. Исследование подтверждает, что зрелость военной культуры способствует формированию чувства социальной сплоченности, национальной стабильности, стабильности государственности и гражданской ответственности.

Ключевые слова: военная культура, молодежь, устойчивое развитие, социальная философия, национальная безопасность, гражданская идентичность, стабильность государства.

The beginning of the twenty-first century is marked by profound transformations in the global system of social, political, and cultural relations. Accelerated globalization, technological progress, intensification of geopolitical competition, and the emergence of non-traditional security threats have significantly altered the conditions of state development. In this context, the issue of sustainability has moved beyond its classical economic and environmental interpretations and has increasingly acquired social, cultural, and axiological dimensions.

Modern states face a paradoxical situation: while material and technological resources continue to expand, social stability and collective cohesion are becoming more fragile. [11, 23] Processes such as value relativism, erosion of historical memory, decline of civic responsibility, and the fragmentation of social identity pose serious challenges to long-term national development. Under these conditions, the sustainability of the state depends not only on institutional efficiency but also on the moral and worldview foundations of society, particularly among the younger generation.

Youth occupies a central position in the reproduction of social systems. It is within youth that future political elites, professional communities, and cultural paradigms are formed. Consequently, the worldview orientations of young people largely determine the trajectory of state development for decades ahead. However, contemporary youth increasingly develops within an environment characterized by information overload, ideological pluralism, and hybrid influence technologies, which often weaken stable civic and national identification.

In this regard, the problem of youth military culture acquires special philosophical significance. Military culture should not be interpreted narrowly as a set of professional defense skills or institutional military practices. [16, 207] In a broader socio-philosophical sense, it represents a system of values, norms, symbols, and behavioral models related to social responsibility, collective security, historical continuity, and the preservation of state sovereignty.

The relevance of military culture among youth is further intensified by the transformation of modern conflicts. Contemporary threats are increasingly asymmetric and multidimensional, encompassing not only armed confrontation but also information warfare, cyber operations, psychological pressure, and ideological manipulation. These forms of confrontation directly target social consciousness, especially that of young people, turning them into a primary object of strategic influence. [12, 108] Under such conditions, the absence of a developed civic and military-value framework increases social vulnerability and weakens national resilience.

Within the philosophy of sustainable development, intergenerational continuity constitutes a fundamental principle. Sustainable development presupposes not only the satisfaction of present needs but also the preservation of social stability, institutional legitimacy, and cultural identity for future generations. From this perspective, youth military culture functions as a mechanism of transmitting fundamental state-forming values from one generation to another, ensuring the continuity of national development.

Despite the growing importance of this issue, military culture is still insufficiently conceptualized within philosophical studies of sustainability. Existing research often examines sustainable development primarily through economic, ecological, or technological lenses, while issues of security culture, civic responsibility, and defense consciousness remain fragmented or treated instrumentally. [13, 194-195] This theoretical gap limits the ability of states to formulate holistic development strategies adapted to contemporary global risks.

Therefore, there is a clear need for a philosophical reinterpretation of youth military culture as an integral component of social sustainable development. Such an approach allows military culture to be understood not as an element of coercion or militarization, but as a form of civic maturity aimed at protecting peace, social order, and constitutional values.

Theoretical Foundations of Military Culture in Social Philosophy

The concept of military culture occupies a specific yet insufficiently systematized place within social philosophy. Its theoretical foundations are formed at the intersection of philosophical anthropology, political philosophy, sociology of culture, and security studies. In classical and contemporary thought, military culture has been interpreted not merely as an institutional phenomenon, but as a reflection of deeper social structures, collective values, and historical forms of social organization.

Émile Durkheim's theory of social solidarity provides one of the earliest philosophical premises for understanding military culture. According to Durkheim, society exists through a system of collective representations that regulate individual behavior and ensure social cohesion. [6, 58] From this perspective, military culture functions as a mechanism of collective moral regulation, strengthening what Durkheim termed *moral density*. Military rituals, symbols, and norms act as instruments through which society reinforces discipline, unity, and shared responsibility. However, Durkheim also warned that excessive rigidity of collective norms may suppress individual autonomy. This ambivalence remains central to contemporary debates on military culture. [6, 103]

Max Weber approached the issue from a different analytical angle. In his theory of legitimate domination, Weber emphasized the importance of rational-legal authority and disciplined organization as foundations of modern statehood. [5, 402] Military institutions, in Weber's interpretation, represent the highest form of rationalized discipline, based on

hierarchy, duty, and predictability of action. Military culture, therefore, embodies the rational ethics of responsibility (*Verantwortungsethik*), where individual action is subordinated to collective goals. [5, 637] At the same time, Weber acknowledged the ethical tension between responsibility and personal conviction, implying that military culture must be morally restrained by legal and civic principles.

From the standpoint of political philosophy, Thomas Hobbes regarded security as the primary condition of social order. In *Leviathan*, Hobbes argued that without the capacity for collective defense, society inevitably collapses into a “state of nature”. [3, 291] Although Hobbes did not explicitly formulate the concept of military culture, his theory implicitly justifies its necessity as a cultural foundation of political stability. Military culture, in this logic, emerges as a civilizational response to existential insecurity.

In contrast, Immanuel Kant introduced a normative limitation to military logic. While recognizing the necessity of defense, Kant insisted that the ultimate goal of political development should be perpetual peace. [4, 73] For Kant, militarism represented a moral contradiction of enlightenment. Nevertheless, Kant’s philosophy does not deny military culture entirely; rather, it demands its subordination to moral law and republican principles. Thus, military culture is legitimate only insofar as it serves peace and legal order, not aggression.

Contemporary social philosophy has further expanded the interpretation of military culture. Michel Foucault analyzed discipline as a form of power embedded in social institutions. From his perspective, military discipline represents a broader model of social regulation that extends into education, bureaucracy, and everyday practices. [18, 246] Foucault’s approach problematizes military culture by revealing its potential to produce “docile bodies”. [18, 251] However, his analysis also demonstrates that discipline is an inevitable feature of modern society, making the question not whether discipline exists, but how it is ethically and politically governed.

Jürgen Habermas, in turn, emphasized the role of communicative rationality in democratic societies. He expressed skepticism toward militarized forms of social integration, arguing that legitimacy must be grounded in public discourse rather than coercion. [2, 307] From a Habermasian perspective, military culture becomes problematic when it replaces dialogue with command. Yet Habermas does not deny the necessity of defense institutions; instead, he situates them within constitutional democracy, where military culture must remain socially accountable and normatively limited. [2, 334]

In modern security philosophy, scholars such as Barry Buzan and the Copenhagen School introduced the concept of *societal security*, emphasizing identity, values, and social cohesion as key objects of protection. [1, 127] Within this framework, military culture is reinterpreted as a component of societal resilience rather than purely armed capacity. Youth military culture, therefore, becomes a mechanism for preserving collective identity under conditions of hybrid and non-military threats.

Building upon these theoretical perspectives, the author maintains that military culture should be conceptualized not as a manifestation of militarism, but as a form of civic-value consciousness embedded within social philosophy.

Youth as a strategic subject of sustainable development

Within contemporary sustainability discourse, youth is increasingly conceptualized not as a passive beneficiary of development policies but as a strategic social subject whose integration determines the long-term stability of the state. This interpretation is particularly relevant for countries with pronounced demographic youth concentration, where the success or failure of development strategies is structurally linked to youth inclusion, employment, education, and civic engagement.

During the period 2020–2025, Uzbekistan has remained one of the youngest societies in Central Asia. According to official statistical data, by 1 January 2025 the population aged 14–30 reached 9.63 million persons, accounting for approximately 25.7% of the total population. [25, 86] Such demographic configuration establishes youth as a decisive structural factor of national development.

From the perspective of social philosophy, this demographic reality transforms youth into a key agent of intergenerational continuity. Sustainable development, understood as the preservation of social stability over time, becomes inseparable from the worldview orientations, civic values, and social integration of this age cohort. A society in which one quarter of the population belongs to youth cannot maintain long-term sustainability without purposeful mechanisms of value reproduction and institutional inclusion.

The empirical dynamics of higher education between 2020 and 2025 demonstrate a significant quantitative expansion. The number of students enrolled in higher education institutions increased steadily, reaching more than 1.43 million students in the 2024/2025 academic year. [10, 19] This growth reflects a strategic orientation toward human capital development as a central pillar of national modernization.

In sustainability terms, higher education functions as a long-term investment in adaptive capacity, innovation potential, and administrative effectiveness. However, philosophical analysis suggests that education alone does not automatically translate into social stability. Without corresponding employment opportunities, civic engagement

channels, and value-based orientation, educational expansion may generate relative deprivation and social frustration among educated youth.

Labour-market integration represents one of the most sensitive indicators of sustainable development. Empirical data from the early 2020s reveal that youth unemployment in Uzbekistan remained significantly higher than overall unemployment rates, reflecting structural challenges associated with rapid demographic growth, sectoral transformation, and skills mismatch.

Youth unemployment is not merely an economic variable; it is a socio-philosophical indicator of recognition and inclusion. Employment provides not only income but also social status, institutional trust, and participation in collective life. Prolonged exclusion from the labour market weakens civic identity and increases vulnerability to radical, protest-oriented, or destructive narratives, thereby undermining social sustainability.

A notable empirical trend during 2020–2025 is the sharp increase in self-employment. The number of self-employed individuals expanded from tens of thousands in 2020 to several million by 2024. This structural shift reflects both state-driven formalization policies and adaptive responses of youth to labour-market constraints.

From a sustainability perspective, self-employment represents an ambivalent phenomenon. On the one hand, it reduces open unemployment and enhances economic flexibility. On the other hand, without adequate social protection mechanisms, it may reinforce precarity and weaken long-term social security. For youth, this duality intensifies the importance of non-material stabilizing factors such as civic responsibility, social discipline, and institutional trust.

Between 2020 and 2025, youth policy in Uzbekistan increasingly emphasized employment facilitation, entrepreneurship support, and social inclusion as strategic priorities. Large-scale state programmes targeted youth employment, professional training, and regional development participation. [25, 73]

In philosophical terms, such policies reflect a transition from perceiving youth as a “social risk group” toward recognizing youth as a co-creator of sustainable development. [23, 97] Nevertheless, policy effectiveness ultimately depends on the internalization of values that connect personal success with collective responsibility.

The empirical experience of Uzbekistan during 2020–2025 demonstrates that youth occupies a structurally decisive position in the sustainability architecture of the state. Demographic weight, educational expansion, employment vulnerability, and institutional transformation collectively define youth as a strategic subject of development rather than its peripheral element.

Under these conditions, sustainable development cannot be ensured solely through economic or administrative measures. It requires complementary value-based mechanisms that reinforce social cohesion, resilience, and civic responsibility. Within this framework, youth military culture – understood in its philosophical sense as discipline, social duty, constitutional loyalty, and readiness for collective action – emerges as a mediating factor between socio-economic inclusion and long-term social stability. [24, 107]

Thus, the Uzbek case confirms the broader theoretical proposition that sustainability in modern states is inseparable from the successful integration of youth as both an economic actor and a bearer of state-forming values.

Military culture in the context of global challenges

In the twenty-first century, military culture is increasingly shaped by the transformation of global challenges that redefine the very nature of security. Traditional interstate wars are no longer the sole or even dominant form of confrontation. Instead, states face hybrid conflicts, information warfare, cyber threats, terrorism, pandemics, and large-scale humanitarian crises. Under these conditions, military culture evolves from a narrowly professional phenomenon into a broader socio-cultural mechanism of national resilience, integrating the armed forces, civil society, and youth into a unified framework of collective responsibility.

A clear illustration of this transformation can be observed in the experience of the Nordic countries, particularly Finland. For decades, Finland has developed a comprehensive concept of “total defense”, [15, 308] in which military culture extends beyond the armed forces to encompass education, civil preparedness, media responsibility, and psychological resilience. Conscription is combined with strong civic education, and citizens are systematically trained to respond to crises ranging from military threats to cyberattacks and natural disasters. As a result, military culture in Finland functions not as militarization, but as a culture of societal preparedness, which significantly enhances national sustainability under conditions of geopolitical pressure in Northern Europe.

A different yet equally instructive example is provided by Switzerland. The Swiss model of armed neutrality is supported by a deeply rooted militia system, where military service is perceived as a civic duty rather than a professional career. Military culture is embedded in everyday social life through reserve service, local defense structures, and public trust in national institutions. [8, 107] This model demonstrates how military culture can coexist with democratic traditions and strong civil liberties, reinforcing social cohesion while maintaining political neutrality. In this case, sustainability is achieved through the balance between individual autonomy and collective responsibility.

In East Asia, the case of South Korea demonstrates how military culture adapts to prolonged geopolitical tension while supporting economic modernization. Mandatory military service has historically played a role in fostering discipline, social integration, and national solidarity. [14, 339] Over time, reforms have aimed at humanizing service conditions and strengthening legal protections, reflecting a conscious effort to align military culture with evolving democratic standards. South Korea's experience shows that military culture can coexist with rapid technological and economic development when integrated into broader modernization strategies.

In contrast, Germany offers an example of post-militarist transformation. After the Second World War, German military culture was deliberately reconstructed on normative foundations emphasizing constitutional loyalty, human rights, and civilian control, embodied in the concept of the "citizen in uniform". [17, 199] This model rejects traditional militarism while preserving defense readiness through ethical self-restraint and democratic accountability. In the context of contemporary European security challenges, Germany's approach demonstrates how military culture can contribute to sustainability by reinforcing democratic legitimacy rather than nationalistic mobilization.

Hybrid threats and information warfare have further expanded the scope of military culture in countries such as Estonia. Following large-scale cyberattacks in 2007, Estonia integrated cyber defense into its national security culture, involving volunteers, IT specialists, and youth organizations. [10, 32] Military culture thus became digitally oriented, emphasizing technological literacy, societal participation, and resilience against cognitive manipulation. This case exemplifies how global challenges reshape military culture into a multidimensional system combining physical, informational, and psychological defense.

Collectively, these international examples demonstrate that military culture in the contemporary world is no longer uniform or exclusively military in nature. It is shaped by historical experience, political systems, and the specific configuration of global risks. [9, 60] Yet across diverse contexts, a common philosophical pattern emerges: military culture contributes to social sustainability when it strengthens resilience, reinforces civic responsibility, and remains subordinated to democratic and humanistic values.

Global challenges have therefore transformed military culture into a strategic resource of sustainable development. States that successfully integrate defense consciousness with education, civic participation, and ethical governance demonstrate greater stability under conditions of uncertainty. [7, 35] Conversely, where military culture is reduced either to coercive power or neglected altogether, societies become more vulnerable to fragmentation and external manipulation. In this sense, military culture operates as a mediator between security and sustainability, translating global risks into socially constructive forms of collective preparedness.

Philosophical interpretation of military culture as a factor of state development

In the context of Uzbekistan's contemporary development, military culture occupies a distinct philosophical position as a factor ensuring the stability, continuity, and strategic orientation of the state. Since independence, the country has pursued a model of development grounded in sovereignty, social harmony, and gradual modernization. Within this framework, military culture cannot be reduced to the technical functioning of the armed forces; rather, it represents a value-based component of statehood that shapes civic consciousness, national identity, and collective responsibility.

From the perspective of social philosophy, the state is not merely a legal or administrative structure but a historically formed community united by shared meanings, symbols, and values. In Uzbekistan, the process of nation-building has been closely connected with the restoration of historical memory, the revival of national traditions, and the formation of a modern civic identity. [20, 291] Military culture plays a mediating role in this process by linking the idea of state sovereignty with moral obligation and social duty. It transforms the abstract concept of independence into an internalized value that acquires personal significance for citizens, particularly for youth.

The philosophical significance of military culture in Uzbekistan is closely related to the country's geopolitical environment. Located in a region characterized by complex security dynamics, transnational threats, and ideological influences, Uzbekistan's development requires not only economic modernization but also social resilience. [19, 57] Military culture, in this sense, functions as a form of collective self-preservation, ensuring the state's capacity to protect its political independence without resorting to aggressive or expansionist doctrines.

Uzbekistan's officially proclaimed principle of a defensive military doctrine reflects an important philosophical stance. Defense is conceptualized not as preparation for war, but as a guarantee of peace, stability, and non-interference. This orientation aligns military culture with humanistic values, emphasizing protection rather than domination. From a philosophical viewpoint, such an approach corresponds to the ethics of responsibility, where the use of force is morally justified only as a means of safeguarding social order and human security.

Military culture in Uzbekistan is also deeply interconnected with the concept of civic unity. The state's development strategy emphasizes interethnic harmony, religious tolerance, and social solidarity. Within this framework, military culture serves not as a divisive force, but as a unifying symbolic space in which citizens of different backgrounds

are integrated through shared commitment to constitutional values. [22, 31] This integrative function is particularly important for maintaining social sustainability in a multicultural society.

A key philosophical dimension of military culture lies in its educational and formative role. The development of patriotic education, pre-conscription training, and civic-moral instruction reflects an understanding that state stability begins with worldview formation. Military culture thus operates as a mechanism of socialization, transmitting norms of discipline, respect for law, responsibility, and collective interest. In this sense, it contributes to the formation of what social philosophy defines as a “responsible citizen”, capable of aligning personal aspirations with national development goals.

From the standpoint of state development, military culture also supports institutional legitimacy. Trust in state institutions grows when citizens perceive the defense system as professional, ethical, and socially oriented. In Uzbekistan, reforms aimed at modernizing the armed forces, improving transparency, and enhancing the social status of military service have strengthened this perception. Philosophically, legitimacy emerges not solely from formal authority, but from the belief that institutions embody shared values and serve the common good.

Military culture further contributes to long-term development through its role in shaping resilience. Contemporary challenges increasingly manifest in non-military forms, including information influence, ideological radicalization, and social polarization. In response, military culture expands into the sphere of moral and cognitive stability. It promotes critical awareness, loyalty to constitutional principles, and resistance to narratives that threaten social cohesion. Thus, military culture becomes a form of internal security rooted in consciousness rather than coercion.

In the Uzbek context, this philosophical interpretation aligns with the broader national development paradigm often described as evolutionary modernization. The state seeks to combine openness to global processes with the preservation of cultural identity and sovereignty. [21, 134] Military culture supports this balance by reinforcing the idea that modernization without value continuity risks social fragmentation. It anchors development in ethical and historical foundations, ensuring that progress does not undermine national unity.

Therefore, military culture in Uzbekistan functions as a factor of state development not through militarization, but through value consolidation. It strengthens the moral infrastructure of sovereignty, supports social harmony, and contributes to the formation of a stable civic identity. From a philosophical standpoint, it represents a mechanism through which the state secures its historical subjectivity, ensuring that development remains not only economically effective, but also socially meaningful and culturally sustainable.

In this sense, military culture may be interpreted as one of the spiritual and institutional pillars of Uzbekistan’s long-term development strategy, integrating security, morality, and civic responsibility into a coherent philosophical model of statehood.

Conclusion

The present study has demonstrated that military culture of youth constitutes a complex socio-philosophical phenomenon that plays a significant role in the sustainable development of the modern state. Moving beyond narrow interpretations that reduce military culture to institutional defense practices, the article has conceptualized it as a value-based system integrating civic responsibility, moral consciousness, historical memory, and readiness for collective action.

The theoretical analysis has shown that within social philosophy, military culture functions as a mechanism of social integration and normative stability. Classical and contemporary philosophical perspectives reveal that discipline, responsibility, and solidarity—when embedded within legal and ethical frameworks—serve not as instruments of coercion, but as foundations of social cohesion. In this sense, military culture contributes to the reproduction of social order and the continuity of statehood.

The empirical examination of Uzbekistan during the period 2020–2025 confirms the strategic importance of youth in national development. Demographic structure, expansion of education, and ongoing challenges of employment integration highlight that sustainable development in Uzbekistan is inseparable from the worldview orientations and civic maturity of the younger generation. Youth emerges not merely as a recipient of state policy, but as an active subject whose values determine long-term stability.

The analysis of military culture in the context of global challenges has further demonstrated that contemporary security threats increasingly target social consciousness rather than physical territory alone. Hybrid conflicts, information warfare, and ideological influence intensify the need for internal resilience grounded in shared values. In this environment, military culture acquires a broader philosophical meaning as a form of moral and cognitive preparedness that strengthens social sustainability.

Within the Uzbek context, military culture has been interpreted as a factor of state development rooted in a defensive, peace-oriented doctrine and aligned with principles of sovereignty, social harmony, and civic unity. Its role lies not in militarization of society, but in consolidating national identity, reinforcing institutional legitimacy, and

preserving intergenerational continuity. Such an interpretation corresponds to a humanistic model of development in which security supports, rather than contradicts, democratic and cultural values.

Overall, the findings of this study allow the conclusion that sustainable development cannot be reduced to economic growth or technological modernization alone. Without a stable value foundation, social cohesion, and collective responsibility, development remains fragile and vulnerable to internal and external shocks. Military culture of youth, understood philosophically, functions as one of the key elements of this foundation.

The article therefore argues that integrating military culture into the broader philosophy of social sustainable development provides a more holistic understanding of state resilience. It enables the alignment of security, morality, and civic consciousness into a unified developmental paradigm, ensuring that progress is not only effective in material terms but also meaningful in social and historical dimensions.

In conditions of increasing global uncertainty, the cultivation of a balanced, ethical, and civic-oriented military culture among youth should be regarded as a long-term strategic investment in the stability, sovereignty, and sustainable future of the state.

References

1. Buzan, B., Wæver, O., de Wilde, J. Security: A New Framework for Analysis. – Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998. – 239 p.
2. Habermas, J. Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy. – Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996. – 631 p.
3. Hobbes, T. Leviathan. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. – 520 p.
4. Kant, I. Perpetual Peace and Other Essays. – Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1983. – 119 p.
5. Weber, M. Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology. – Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978. – 1469 p.
6. Durkheim, É. The Division of Labour in Society. – London: Macmillan, 1984. – 352 p.
7. Giddens, A. The Consequences of Modernity. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990. – 188 p.
8. Beck, U. Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity. – London: Sage Publications, 1992. – 272 p.
9. Paris, R. At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. – 306 p.
10. United Nations. Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. – New York: UN, 2015. – 41 p.
11. Бердяев Н. А. Судьба России. – М.: Республика, 1990. – 336 с.
12. Ильин И. А. О сопротивлении злу силою. – М.: Русская книга, 1996. – 256 с.
13. Панарин А. С. Стратегическая нестабильность в XXI веке. – М.: Алгоритм, 2004. – 448 с.
14. Кастельс М. Информационная эпоха: экономика, общество и культура. – М.: ГУ ВШЭ, 2000. – 608 с.
15. Тоффлер Э. Третья волна. – М.: АСТ, 2004. – 784 с.
16. Федотов Г. П. Судьба и грехи России. – СПб.: Изд-во РХГА, 1992. – 352 с.
17. Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций и преобразование мирового порядка. – М.: АСТ, 2003. – 603 с.
18. Цыганков П. А. Теория международных отношений. – М.: Гардарики, 2003. – 590 с.
19. Каримов И. А. Юксак маънавият – енгилмас куч. – Тошкент: Маънавият, 2008. – 176 б.
20. Мирзиёев Ш. М. Янги Ўзбекистон стратегияси. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон, 2021. – 464 б.
21. Қодиров М. Фалсафа. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 2010. – 320 б.
22. Эркаев А. Миллий ғоя ва маънавий тараққиёт. – Тошкент: Академия, 2005. – 256 б.
23. Жўраев Н. Ўзбекистоннинг миллий тараққиёт модели. – Тошкент: Фан, 2012. – 288 б.
24. Абдуллаев А. Ёшлар маънавияти ва ижтимоий барқарорлик. – Тошкент: Тафаккур, 2018. – 192 б.
25. Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти ҳузуридаги Стратегик ва минтақавий тадқиқотлар институти. Ўзбекистонда ёшлар сиёсати: ривожланиш стратегияси. – Тошкент, 2022. – 148 б.