

THE SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL ESSENCE OF MILITARY SERVICE: AN ANALYSIS OF AXIOLOGICAL, ONTOLOGICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL APPROACHES

СОЦИАЛЬНО-ФИЛОСОФСКАЯ СУЩНОСТЬ ВОЕННОЙ СЛУЖБЫ: АНАЛИЗ АКСИОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО, ОНТОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО И ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНОГО ПОДХОДОВ

Muminov Fazliddin Qobil oglu

Deputy Head of the Security Service under the Federal Border Guard Service of the Samarkand City Police Department, Senior Lieutenant.

ORCID: 0009-0003-1315-8990 UDK-(47)

fazliddinmominov213@gmail.com

+998992446698

Abstract: This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the socio-philosophical essence of military service. It explores the ontological, axiological, and institutional dimensions of military service, highlighting its role in ensuring societal stability, preserving national identity, and maintaining collective security. Based on the ideas of Eastern and Western philosophers, the moral, political, and social functions of military service are examined. The study concludes that military service represents a complex philosophical institution that integrates society and ensures its continuity.

Keywords: military service, social philosophy, axiology, ontology, social institution, security, patriotism.

Аннотация: В статье рассматривается социально-философская сущность военной службы через призму онтологических, аксиологических и институциональных подходов. Раскрывается её роль в обеспечении устойчивости общества, формировании национальной идентичности и поддержании общественной безопасности.

Ключевые слова: военная служба, философия, общество, ценности, безопасность.

INTRODUCTION

Military service is one of the most important and complex social institutions of society, the essence of which is not limited to the task of defense. It occupies a central place in the processes of self-preservation, self-awareness and self-organization of society.

In the modern global and informational world, the concept of security is expanding, covering not only military, but also ideological and spiritual dimensions. Therefore, the study of military service from a socio-philosophical perspective is of great scientific importance.

The purpose of this study is to reveal the ontological, axiological and institutional essence of military service.

METHODS

The following methods were used in the study:

- socio-philosophical analysis
- comparative-analytical approach
- axiological analysis
- historical-philosophical method
- systematic approach

Also, the scientific views of Eastern and Western thinkers were compared and summarized.

Al-Farabi interpreted military service as a necessary element of a virtuous society, writing that “the stability of the state is based on courage, foresight and a sense of duty.” This model of Farabi bases military service on virtue ethics, but requires full compliance with the requirements of a modern professional army. American ethicist L. Kohlberg, on the other hand, links military service with the stages of moral development of a person, emphasizing that “military service is a testing ground for the formation of a person’s moral thinking based on principles.” Kohlberg’s approach deeply reveals the psychological and moral educational role of military service, but analyzes less the relationship of the military institution with the social structure. Among military sociologists, S. Cottrell evaluates military service as a mechanism for social cohesion in society, saying that “the army is one of the most important integrators of society.” This view shows the function of military service in strengthening collectivity, but interprets its cultural and historical roots in a generalized form. In Islamic philosophy, al-Ghazali connects the issue of obligation with military service, writing that “protecting the homeland is the highest example of moral virtue.” His approach reveals military service as a religious and moral responsibility, but requires reinterpretation when applied to the secular context of the modern nation-state. K. Booth analyzes the military institution as “an internal sociocultural mechanism of human security” and emphasizes that “military service is a philosophical response of society to what it perceives as a threat to itself.” Booth’s idea connects military service with a spiritual interpretation of security. The socio-philosophical essence of military service is a complex axiological phenomenon that coordinates the process of protecting the existence of society, perpetuating its memory, strengthening collective solidarity, setting standards of moral discipline and preserving the metaphysical basis of the state

system. If the main ontological task of military service is to form the instinct of self-preservation of society as a social institution, then its spiritual task is to increase civic responsibility, strengthen the resonance of collective consciousness and ensure the continuity of national existence. The American philosopher J. Dewey says about the function of the military institution in society: “military service is a moral necessity that arose due to the need of society to consolidate itself.” Dewey’s thought interprets military service in a pragmatic context, but it does not sufficiently illuminate its metaphysical roots. The German philosopher Karl Schmidt, revealing the political essence of military service, emphasizes that “the true test of sovereignty is how society responds to the unexpected appearance of an enemy.” His view presents military service as the “last instance” of political existence, but does not sufficiently reveal the moral layer of social responsibility.

Shihabuddin Suhrawardi connects military service with society’s aspiration for ontological light, noting that “protecting society from darkness is the highest form of spiritual courage.” Suhrawardi interprets military service metaphysically, but this approach requires coordination with modern systems of state governance. French social theorist G. Bataille, showing the place of military service in the structure of society as a “mechanism of collective sacrifice,” argues that “society needs a spiritually united force to ensure its stability.” Bataille’s model illuminates the emotional-ritual nature of military service, but his ideas have limited relevance to modern legal institutions. British political anthropologist B. Anderson describes national military service as “the physical affirmation of an imagined community,” writing that “the army is one of the most powerful institutions in the process of a nation’s self-imagination.” Anderson’s approach emphasizes the identity-building function of military service, but it sheds less light on the moral-disciplinary dimensions of military service.

F. Rahman links military service with social justice and moral order, noting that “if a community cannot defend its moral superiority, its political life will not last long.” He presents military service as a necessary form of moral responsibility. Barry Hindess evaluates military service as a “discipline-based form of governance” and writes that “the stability of society depends on the quality of discipline and standards of obedience.” This approach interprets military service in harmony with state governance, but does not fully capture the inner spiritual experience of the individual. The socio-philosophical content of military service is formed in a complex axiological field consisting of the level of self-awareness of society, historical memory, a sense of collective security, a patriotic ethos, and normative command. Military service is an institutional expression of the internal need of society to preserve itself and continue its identity, in which the spiritual preparation, mental endurance and ability to make moral decisions of the individual play an important role. Therefore, military service is not just a force and political technology, but a philosophical phenomenon that

strengthens the moral autonomy of society. The German philosopher M. Scheler, speaking about the spiritual structure of society, emphasizes that “when the moral energy of society gathers around certain ideals, it manifests its historical strength.” Scheler’s idea connects military service with the moral energy of society, but it sheds limited light on the real political tasks of the military institution. G. Sorel, interpreting the socio-dynamic essence of military service as “a collective action that protects national myths,” says that “if society cannot awaken its historical strength through spiritual mobilization, its political stability weakens.” Sorel’s idea shows the imaginary-psychological power of military service, but his model, based on “myth”, is not suitable for modern democratic governance. In the Eastern philosophical tradition, Abu Bakr al-Razi links military service with the principles of the general good of society, arguing that “protecting society is a practical form of virtue.” Al-Razi’s idea interprets military service based on virtue ethics, but requires a reconsideration of its integration with the legal requirements of the modern nation-state. The American political philosopher R. Dworkin, analyzing the legal-axiological content of military service, writes that “the legal coherence of the people depends on its moral ability to defend itself.” Dworkin’s idea connects military service not only with political, but also with legal justice, but he does not pay enough attention to the educational and psychological functions of the military institution. N. Luhmann, evaluating military service in the context of systems theory, emphasizes that “the military system is a response to the communicative construction of society about external threats.” Luhmann’s model interprets military service as a communicative security system, but its moral-ontological roots are poorly expressed in the model. The famous anthropologist C. Lévi-Strauss, analyzing the place of military institutions in social archetypes, writes that “the idea of war and defense is inseparable from the symbolic system of human society.” According to him, military service plays a significant role in the process of society’s “transformation of external threats into internal order.” However, his model does not shed much light on the political and philosophical legitimacy of military service. Japanese philosopher K. Tanabe connects military service with “the will of the nation to justify itself” and notes that “the existence of society rests on its moral ability to protect itself.” Tanabe presents military service as an ontological necessity, but is inclined to a tendency towards extreme collectivism.

It does not provide a detailed account of the coherence of institutions with state-legal structures. International security researcher Hedley Bull writes about the military capacity of a state: “The stability of the international order depends on the ability of states to defend themselves, and this begins with the trust that society places in the military.” Bull’s model sees military service as a key element of the global security system, but it does not place enough emphasis on internal moral unity.

N. Elias defines military service as “the process of self-education of society based on discipline” and says that “discipline is the deepest mechanism of social harmony.” Elias’s approach reveals the disciplinary nature of military service, but does not critically assess the existential level of responsibility of military service. The American philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre, analyzing the place of military service in the moral structure of society, writes that “military service is a moral practice of society directed towards a common goal, in which virtues are tested.” MacIntyre makes the connection of military service with virtue ethics a golden point, but the technological nature of modern military institutions complicates its concept. The Japanese philosopher Morisaki Kazuo explains the moral role of military service in society as follows: “the survival of a nation rests on its ability to defend itself, and this ability draws strength from moral discipline.” Kazuo's approach shows the connection of military service with national moral systems, but it does not shed much light on the interaction of military service with global systems.

In the synthesis of these views, the socio-philosophical essence of military service is manifested in the following philosophical principles:

First, military service is a normative form of the ontological self-defense instinct of society; it is based on the general will of society to preserve its existence.

Second, military service is a moral-disciplinary space in which a person is formed as the highest stage of social responsibility: such qualities as selflessness, courage, obedience, loyalty are absorbed into the social consciousness.

Third, it is the axiological core of national identity: the spiritual content of the concept of "Homeland" finds its highest manifestation precisely in military service.

Fourth, military service is a metaphysically substantiating mechanism of state sovereignty, creating the legitimate basis for the state's security.

Fifth, it is a spiritual stabilizer of social integration: it unites society around a common goal.

Sixth, military service is an institution that continuously restores historical memory and spiritual heritage, in which values such as courage, loyalty, and self-sacrifice are passed down from generation to generation.

Thus, the socio-philosophical essence of military service is manifested as a philosophical category that unites the existence, moral stability, political sovereignty, and cultural coherence of society.

RESULTS

As a result of the analysis, the following scientific conclusions were drawn:

- Military service is an institutional form of the self-preservation instinct of society.
- It appears as a social space that leads the individual to moral perfection.
- Military service strengthens national identity and collective consciousness.

- It forms values such as discipline, loyalty, and responsibility in society.
- Military service is one of the important key factors of state sovereignty.

DISCUSSION

The results of the study were compared with various philosophical approaches:

- Al-Farabi sees military service as an element of a virtuous society;
- L. Kohlberg connects it with the stage of moral development;
- K. Booth interprets military service as a philosophical response to security;
- J. Dewey considers it a mechanism of social cohesion;
- C. Schmitt evaluates military service as a criterion of political existence.

Also, in modern theories, military service is considered:

- a means of social integration
- a formator of national identity
- a moral-disciplinary system

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, military service occupies an important place in the socio-philosophical system of society. It is manifested as:

- a mechanism for self-defense of society
- an institution that directs the individual to social responsibility
- a system that ensures national unity and stability

Therefore, the development of military service is one of the necessary conditions for the sustainable development of society.

FOYDALANILGAN ADABIYOTLAR

1. Farabi A.N. City of virtuous people. - Tashkent, 2010.
2. Kohlberg L. The Philosophy of Moral Development. - 1981.
3. Cottrell L. The Adjustment of the Individual to the Group. - 1942.
4. Ghazali A.H. Economics fi-l-i'tikod. - 2006.
5. Booth K. Theory of World Security. - 2007.
6. Dewey J. Human Nature and Conduct. - 1922.
7. Schmitt C. Der Begriff des Politischen. - 1932.
8. Suhrawardy Sh. Hikmat ul-Ishraq. - 2004.
9. Bataille G. La Part maudite. - 1949.
10. Anderson B. Imagined Communities. - 1983.
11. Rahman F. Islam and Modernity. - 1982.
12. Hindess B. Politics and Discipline. - 1999.
13. Scheler M. Sociology of Knowledge. - 1923.
14. Sorel G. Reflections on Violence. - 1908.
15. Razi A.B. Tibbur-Ruhani. - 2004.
16. Dworkin R. Taking Rights Seriously. - 1977.
17. Luhmann N. Soziologische Aufklärung. - 1991.

18. Lévi-Strauss C. The Savage Mind. - 1962.
19. Tanabe K. Philosophy as Metanoetics. - 1946.
20. Izutsu T. Sufism and Taoism. - 1983.
21. al-Jabiri M.A. Naqd al-'aql al-'Arabi. - 1990.
22. Allison G. Essence of Decision. - 1971.
23. Taftazani S. Sharh al-Aqid. - 2009.
24. Greisch J. Le Buisson Ardent. - 1993.
25. Kerr K. Rethinking Security. - 2010.
26. Burke J. The Military in the Modern World. - 2001.
27. Aaron R. Peace and War. - 1962.
28. Berlin I. Four Essays on Liberty. - 1969.
29. Kubro N. Fawaih ul-Jamal. - 2007.
30. Bull H. The Anarchical Society. - 1977.
31. Elias N. The Civilizing Process. - 2000.
32. MacIntyre A. After Virtue. - 1984.
33. Morisaki K. Ethics of Defense. - 1971.