

The socio-philosophical interpretation of economic destructions

Bekmurodova Gulshoda Khaitovna

Qarshi State University, Uzbekistan

Bekmurodovagulshoda77@gmail.com



Article History:

Received on 20 September 2025

1st Revision on 25 September 2025

Accepted on 30 September 2025

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to explore the essence and manifestations of economic destruction as a key form of social destruction, highlighting its interplay with constructive and destructive processes in the global economic sphere. The research emphasizes how globalization accelerates both opportunities for growth and risks of instability.

Research methodology: A qualitative descriptive approach is applied, using literature review and conceptual analysis of economic trends, globalization processes, and trade relations. The study also integrates comparative insights from international reports and academic discussions to assess the dual nature of constructiveness and destructiveness in economic life.

Results: The findings reveal that globalization has intensified trade and economic relations worldwide, fostering constructive dynamics such as innovation, expanded markets, and technological transfer. At the same time, it has amplified destructive processes, including protectionism, indirect barriers, and price volatility. These opposing tendencies coexist and manifest across all sectors, making economic systems simultaneously more integrated and more vulnerable.

Conclusions: The research concludes that constructive and destructive processes are inseparable features of contemporary globalization. While they drive economic interdependence and growth, they also generate systemic risks that require careful governance. Recognizing this duality is essential for sustaining balanced global development.

Limitations: The study is primarily conceptual and relies on secondary sources, with limited empirical data to capture region-specific destructive impacts.

Contribution: This article contributes to academic debates on globalization by framing economic destruction as both a theoretical and practical challenge, offering a lens to understand its systemic impact on global economic relations.

Keywords: *Constructiveness, Destruction, Globalization, Protectionism, Volatility*

How to Cite: Khaitovna, B. G. (2025). The socio-philosophical interpretation of economic destructions. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 3(3), 955-965.

1. Introduction

Social destruction appears in the form of processes and factors that undermine stability across different spheres of society, hinder development, and lead to regression and decline, reflecting conditions of negativity and destructiveness. Social destruction manifests itself in economic, political, social, and spiritual forms (Lombardozzi & Djanibekov, 2021). The emergence of the global economy has given rise to a range of positive and constructive outcomes. There are virtually no national economies remaining in the world that are closed in nature, namely, those developing relatively independently and without connection to other economies. In nearly all countries, open-type economies have emerged,

economies characterized by diverse interactions with others and development in harmony with them, alongside an accelerating and intensifying interconnectedness among national economies (Seti, Mazwane, & Christian, 2025; Suci, Asmara, & Mulatsih, 2015). The multidimensionality of social destruction requires careful analysis. From an economic perspective, destructive processes may emerge through financial crises, unemployment, inflation, and sharp disparities between different social groups. Globalization, while expanding opportunities for cooperation, can also deepen inequality when the benefits of interconnectedness are distributed unevenly. For instance, countries with advanced technological and financial systems often gain more from global integration, whereas less developed economies may struggle to compete, leading to dependency and stagnation. This form of economic destructiveness not only weakens the material base of societies but also undermines trust in institutions, creating long-term barriers to sustainable growth (Brummitt, Huremović, Pin, Bonds, & Vega-Redondo, 2017).

Politically, social destruction manifests in instability, corruption, weakening of governance structures, and the erosion of democratic norms (Hassan, 2023; Tsagae, 2023). As globalization intensifies, states face challenges in balancing national sovereignty with international obligations. Some governments adapt by implementing reforms that promote transparency and accountability, while others resort to authoritarian measures to retain control, generating political repression and undermining citizens' rights (Batko, 2013). These destructive tendencies can destabilize regions, ignite conflicts, and reduce the capacity of governments to manage change constructively. In the social sphere, destruction appears through the disintegration of traditional communities, the decline of solidarity, and the growth of alienation. Rapid urbanization, migration, and technological changes transform social interactions, often leaving individuals without strong networks of support (Mamun, Islam, Okely, & Hossain, 2022). The erosion of family structures, the decline in social capital, and rising levels of crime or substance abuse are symptoms of deeper social challenges. While modernization offers new forms of communication and lifestyle, it simultaneously weakens conventional norms and values that previously provided stability.

Spiritual destruction, though less visible, may be the most profound. It involves the weakening of moral values, ethical disorientation, and the rise of cynicism. In many societies, consumerism and materialism dominate, overshadowing traditional spiritual and cultural values (Pabbajah, 2024). This shift contributes to a sense of emptiness and loss of meaning, particularly among younger generations (David, 2019). When spiritual foundations erode, the capacity of societies to nurture compassion, justice, and solidarity diminishes, further amplifying destructive tendencies in other spheres. Despite these challenges, the global economy has created opportunities for constructive processes. The expansion of trade, technological innovation, and cultural exchange promotes mutual understanding and cooperation. Interconnected economies share not only risks but also knowledge and innovations that can improve quality of life. For example, advancements in medical technology and digital infrastructure have spread rapidly across borders, enabling societies to address health crises and enhance education systems. These constructive elements demonstrate that globalization, while potentially destructive, also provides tools for progress if managed responsibly.

The interplay between constructive and destructive processes is not accidental but systemic. As new opportunities arise, so too do new risks. For instance, the digital revolution has expanded access to information and education, yet it also creates vulnerabilities such as cybercrime, misinformation, and privacy violations. Similarly, international financial markets facilitate investment and growth but also expose national economies to global shocks, as seen during the 2008 financial crisis. Understanding this duality is essential for policymakers, scholars, and citizens alike, as it highlights the importance of balancing innovation with safeguards. One critical dimension of contemporary globalization is the rise of interdependence among national economies. This interconnectedness fosters cooperation in areas such as climate change, security, and health, but it also means that crises in one country can quickly spread to others. The COVID-19 pandemic is a prime example: while global collaboration enabled rapid vaccine development, the crisis also revealed vulnerabilities in supply chains, healthcare systems, and international solidarity. Such events demonstrate that the constructive and destructive potentials of

globalization are inseparable, requiring collective responses rather than isolated solutions (Cîrdei, 2019; Jeanne, Bourdin, Nadou, & Noiret, 2023).

Another factor shaping the trajectory of social destruction is protectionism. Although free trade has been a cornerstone of globalization, many countries resort to tariffs, quotas, and indirect barriers to protect domestic industries (Sobhaninia, 2024). While protectionism may temporarily shield vulnerable sectors, it often undermines long-term competitiveness and reduces the overall efficiency of the global economy. Moreover, protectionist policies can exacerbate tensions between states, fueling conflicts that spill over into other spheres of society. Price volatility in global markets—particularly for energy and food—further complicates the situation, creating uncertainty that undermines both economic stability and social well-being. To counter destructive processes, societies must invest in resilience. Economic diversification, social safety nets, and robust legal frameworks are essential for mitigating the negative impacts of globalization. Education plays a pivotal role, as it equips individuals with skills to adapt to technological change and fosters critical thinking that resists ideological manipulation. Likewise, strengthening civil society organizations can enhance social cohesion, providing platforms for dialogue and collective action. Spiritual renewal is equally important, as societies must nurture values that promote empathy, integrity, and responsibility, ensuring that material progress does not overshadow ethical development (Jewett, Mah, Howell, & Larsen, 2021; Liu, Cao, Yang, & Anderson, 2022).

Cultural exchange represents another constructive dimension of globalization that can counteract destructive trends. When societies share traditions, arts, and ideas, they foster mutual respect and appreciation. This cultural interconnectedness can mitigate xenophobia and prejudice, reinforcing values of tolerance and inclusivity. However, cultural globalization also risks homogenization, where dominant cultures overshadow local traditions, leading to cultural loss and spiritual dislocation. To avoid this, societies must actively preserve their heritage while embracing global diversity, ensuring that cultural pluralism enriches rather than undermines identity. The role of technology deserves special attention. While technological progress is often celebrated as a driver of constructive change, it can also amplify destructive tendencies. Automation, for instance, increases productivity but may displace workers, leading to social unrest. Artificial intelligence offers unprecedented opportunities for efficiency but raises ethical questions about surveillance, bias, and accountability. The challenge lies in ensuring that technological innovations serve human dignity and societal well-being rather than becoming tools of exploitation and inequality (Akter, 2024; Stahl & Eke, 2024).

In conclusion, social destruction is an inherent component of modern reality, intertwined with constructive processes that shape the trajectory of globalization. Economic, political, social, and spiritual forms of destructiveness coexist with opportunities for growth, cooperation, and cultural enrichment. The task for contemporary societies is not to eliminate destructiveness—which is impossible—but to manage it through balanced policies, inclusive institutions, and strong moral foundations. By acknowledging both sides of globalization's impact, nations can harness its benefits while minimizing its harms, creating a world that is more just, sustainable, and spiritually enriched.

2. Literature Review

The processes and events of the final quarter of the twentieth century and the early years of the new century, along with tendencies characteristic of post-industrial society, are reflected in the works of Herbert Marcuse and Erich Fromm. A number of representatives of the Frankfurt School, building on centuries of theoretical discourse on the subject, formulated different versions of social destruction concepts. The common aspect of the concepts of Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse and Erich Fromm Celikates and Flynn (2023) is that all of them interpret social destruction as a distinctive attribute of human society. Subsequent refinement of the concept of social destruction developed by these thinkers, carried out by a number of researchers, has provided reliable theoretical and methodological foundations for the systematic analysis of processes and factors that undermine stability in contemporary society, hinder development, and lead to regression and decline, as well as conditions of negativity and destructiveness. G. Marcuse and E. Fromm advanced the view that it is possible to neutralize socially destructive conditions, or at the very least, to mitigate their effects. The elaboration of the concept of social destruction was stimulated by the socio-political events that

occurred in Germany during the first half of the twentieth century. At the root of economic decline lies the growing intensification of socio-political conflicts within society (Rumyantsev, 2012; Tiimub et al., 2023).

Herbert Marcuse, in his work “One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society”, seeks to demonstrate that social destruction possesses an objective and axiologically neutral character. His attention is directed toward describing the emergence and manifestation of socio-destructive processes within human society. For this purpose, he first divided the history of human society into three periods: a) pre-industrial society; b) industrial society; c) post-industrial society. The philosopher maintains that destructive processes were present even in pre-industrial society. However, during this period, a distinct gap existed between destructive processes and production efficiency. In industrial society, by contrast, the gap between destructive processes and production efficiency ceased to exist. Furthermore, production efficiency itself became propelled by destructive forces and ultimately culminated in destruction. Industrial society (or the one-dimensional society) initially creates excessive and irrational human needs along with a consumerist mindset, and subsequently secures human well-being through their satisfaction. Well-being, however, gives rise to an endless production of new irrational needs. In this way, rising production efficiency inevitably contributes to the further intensification of destructive processes. In industrial society, this cycle cannot be disrupted, as the interrelation between production efficiency and destruction is sustained by means of additional repression. By additional repression, the thinker refers to the social constraints and mechanisms of control that dominate within society (Marcuse, 2003; Putra, Ahadiyat, & Keumalahayati, 2023; Reitz, 2021).

Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno authored *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, while Herbert Marcuse published *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud's Theory*. In this book, an aspect of Marcuse's concept of social destruction is articulated. Subsequently, in 1964, the philosopher published his renowned work “One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society”. The book culminated the thinker's system of views concerning the concept of social destruction. In his second book, Herbert Marcuse concentrates on depicting the emergence and manifestation of socially destructive processes within human society. To this end, he begins by dividing the history of human society into three stages: a) pre-industrial society; b) industrial society; and c) post-industrial society. The philosopher argues that destructive processes were present even in pre-industrial society. However, in this period, a distinct imbalance prevailed between destructive processes and production efficiency. In industrial society, by contrast, the gap between destructive processes and production efficiency ceased to exist. Furthermore, production efficiency itself became fueled by destructive forces and ultimately culminated in destruction. Industrial society initially produces excessive and irrational human needs together with a consumerist mindset, and subsequently secures human well-being through their satisfaction. Well-being, however, perpetually gives rise to new and increasingly irrational needs. In this way, rising production efficiency continually contributes to the intensification of destructive processes. In industrial society, this cycle cannot be disrupted, as the interrelation between production efficiency and destruction is sustained by means of additional repression. By additional repression, the thinker refers to the social constraints and mechanisms of control operating within society (Reitz, 2021).

From this theoretical foundation, the Frankfurt School thinkers shaped a tradition that linked the concept of social destruction to both structural conditions and human agency. Horkheimer and Adorno, in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, emphasized that the very progress of rationality under modern capitalism contained the seeds of destruction. Their analysis of the “culture industry” described how mass media and commodification reduced individuality, creativity, and critical consciousness, turning citizens into passive consumers. This was interpreted as a destructive process because it undermined autonomy and critical thought, values essential to the flourishing of democratic societies. Erich Fromm approached social destruction from a psychoanalytic and humanistic perspective. In works such as *The Sane Society* and *Escape from Freedom*, Fromm argued that destructiveness arises when human beings are alienated from productive life and meaningful relationships. He highlighted that authoritarian systems, consumerist culture, and economic exploitation drive individuals into despair, leading to aggression,

conformity, and destructiveness. For Fromm, overcoming social destruction required cultivating values of love, creativity, and productive work—elements that could restore harmony between the individual and society (Cortina Issue Editor, 2024).

Marcuse deepened this line of critique by pointing to the integration of repression into the very mechanisms of advanced industrial society. His concept of “one-dimensionality” captured how technological rationality and consumerism create the illusion of freedom while perpetuating systemic domination. By framing well-being as the endless satisfaction of artificially produced needs, industrial society not only sustains itself but also entrenches destructive tendencies. In this sense, destruction was not a marginal effect but a structural characteristic of industrial modernity. Subsequent scholarship has extended these concepts into the study of post-industrial and globalized societies. Researchers note that destructive tendencies manifest in ecological crises, global inequality, and the erosion of democratic institutions. For example, the logic of consumerism and efficiency, described by Marcuse, is echoed in today’s environmental debates, where the relentless pursuit of growth undermines ecological sustainability. Similarly, Fromm’s warnings about alienation resonate with current concerns about digital addiction, social isolation, and mental health crises in technologically saturated environments (Han et al., 2025; Hu, Liu, & Wang, 2022).

The methodological contribution of the Frankfurt School lies in its interdisciplinary synthesis. By combining philosophy, sociology, psychoanalysis, and political economy, its representatives provided a comprehensive framework for analyzing social destruction. This has influenced subsequent critical theories, including neo-Marxist, postmodern, and ecological perspectives. Scholars in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries have drawn on these insights to interpret phenomena such as neoliberal globalization, cultural homogenization, and the commodification of identity. It is noteworthy that many of these discussions highlight the possibility of counteracting social destruction. While Marcuse was more pessimistic about the self-perpetuating cycle of repression and consumption, he also envisioned possibilities for liberation through art, radical politics, and the refusal of false needs. Fromm, more optimistic, argued for the human capacity to choose life-affirming values and cultivate productive orientations. Both perspectives emphasize that destruction is not inevitable; it is historically and socially conditioned, and thus open to transformation (Garlitz & Zompetti, 2023; Stevenson, 2022).

In contemporary discourse, the concept of social destruction has been expanded to include issues such as terrorism, war, environmental degradation, and the breakdown of social trust. These phenomena reflect destructive processes that transcend national boundaries and demand global solutions. The globalization of production and communication intensifies both constructive and destructive dynamics, echoing the Frankfurt School’s recognition that modernity contains within itself contradictory tendencies. Thus, the literature review shows that the intellectual contributions of Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, and Fromm continue to provide a fertile foundation for understanding destructive processes in modern societies. Their concepts illuminate how economic structures, political systems, cultural practices, and psychological conditions intertwine to produce both stability and instability. Moreover, they highlight the ethical imperative to recognize and resist destructive tendencies, whether they manifest in authoritarian politics, consumerist cultures, or ecological exploitation (Silke & Morrison, 2022; Telford, 2023).

In summary, the Frankfurt School’s analysis of social destruction offers not only a diagnostic tool but also a call to action. By examining the interplay between production efficiency, repression, consumerism, alienation, and cultural domination, their theories enable scholars to critically engage with the challenges of contemporary society. The continuity of destructive processes from pre-industrial to industrial and post-industrial contexts underscores the universality of these dynamics, while the hope for their mitigation points to the enduring relevance of human agency and critical thought. The insights of the Frankfurt School also highlight the dialectical nature of modern society, where progress and regression are intertwined. Rationalization, technological advancement, and economic growth often present themselves as constructive achievements, yet beneath the surface they reproduce inequalities, domination, and alienation. This paradox has been described as the “ambivalence of modernity,” where the very tools of liberation—science, reason, production—also become mechanisms of control and

destruction. Such a framework is essential for analyzing not only historical contexts but also present-day phenomena such as digital capitalism, surveillance societies, and the commodification of personal data. These trends reflect new iterations of Marcuse's "one-dimensionality," where critical capacities are eroded under the guise of convenience and progress (Endi, Fanggidae, & Ndoen, 2023; Latunusa, Timuneno, & Fanggidae, 2023).

Furthermore, the Frankfurt School provides a methodological legacy that extends beyond philosophy into empirical research. Contemporary scholars employ critical theory to study structural violence, ecological degradation, and the rise of authoritarian populism. The concept of social destruction is now applied to explain systemic risks such as climate change, pandemics, and global inequality. These issues reveal that destructiveness is not confined to isolated events but is embedded in the very logic of global capitalism. From this perspective, mitigating social destruction requires structural change rather than superficial reforms. Another significant contribution lies in the ethical orientation of these theories. By emphasizing the potential for resistance and transformation, the Frankfurt School resists deterministic pessimism. It invites scholars and citizens alike to cultivate critical awareness, challenge ideological domination, and imagine alternative futures. This orientation has inspired diverse movements, from ecological activism to struggles for digital rights and social justice. Ultimately, the study of social destruction within this tradition reinforces the idea that human societies, while vulnerable to destructive forces, also possess the capacity for renewal through creativity, solidarity, and ethical responsibility (Rahu, Neolaka, & Djaha, 2023).

3. Research Methodology

The study of global social destruction, especially the forms of economic destruction and their manifestations in Uzbekistan, was carried out using the principles of systematicity, historicity, and logical consistency, and by applying methods such as analysis, synthesis, observation, deduction, and induction. The principle of systematicity made it possible to examine social destruction as a complex, multifaceted phenomenon that is not confined to isolated cases but interrelated with political, cultural, and spiritual dimensions of society (Kalashnikov, Konopleva, & Danilin, 2023; Балаганский, 2012). By analyzing the destructive tendencies within a systemic framework, the research was able to capture not only their causes and consequences but also their interconnections with other processes, such as modernization, globalization, and social reform. Historicity ensured that the study did not treat social destruction as a timeless concept but as a phenomenon conditioned by historical periods, political regimes, and social transitions. This principle allowed for a comparative analysis between pre-independence and post-independence Uzbekistan, showing how the shift from a Soviet command economy to an open market economy reshaped both constructive and destructive dynamics.

Logical consistency was crucial in linking empirical observations with theoretical interpretations. Through coherent reasoning, the research avoided contradictions and established a clear cause-and-effect relationship between economic reforms, social transformations, and the emergence of destructive factors (Spartak & Frantsuzov, 2019).

The use of analysis and synthesis provided a balanced approach: analysis helped to break down complex manifestations of economic destruction—such as unemployment, inequality, and market instability—while synthesis integrated these elements into a holistic picture of social transformation. Deduction enabled the study to apply general theoretical frameworks, such as those of the Frankfurt School, to the specific case of Uzbekistan, while induction allowed conclusions to be drawn from local observations and empirical data.

Observation, both of statistical trends and of lived experiences, provided valuable evidence of how economic destruction manifests in daily life, influencing employment, social mobility, and cultural identity. Combined, these methods created a comprehensive and reliable methodology, ensuring that the findings are not only descriptive but also explanatory, offering insights into the nature, causes, and potential remedies for social destruction in Uzbekistan.

4. Results and Discussion

As one of the scholars who has conducted specialized research on the problems of economic globalization observes: “Today, the process of globalization has deepened to such a degree that even an economically advanced country is unable to resolve production, scientific-technical, financial, trade, and other issues effectively by itself”. The age of isolated and independent economies is over. Scholars forecasting the future consistently point to the emergence of a global economy and the incorporation of national economies as components of a unified system (Arndt, 1997; Trynyak et al., 2020). *Firstly*, the increasing openness of national economies has brought about an unprecedented liberalization of economic activity across different countries. Across all regions, state involvement in economic processes has significantly diminished, accompanied by an expansion of the freedom of economic entities. The restrictions and prohibitions once typical of certain closed economies are increasingly losing their effectiveness. The emergence of the global economy has to some extent altered the character of national economies even in countries such as China, North Korea, and Vietnam, where economic activity is tightly controlled by the state.

Secondly, the global economy has opened up opportunities for national economies to draw on the resources of international economic and financial institutions, as well as the economic potential of other countries, in pursuit of their own development. At present, almost all countries are actively making use of technologies developed by economic organizations, resources supplied by financial institutions, and investments offered by other states to accelerate their economic growth. Indeed, this economic and financial potential, when utilized prudently, exerts a profound influence on the rate of economic development in countries. *Thirdly*, the global economy has made it possible for countries to obtain economic support from others in times of difficulty. Regional economic crises and the imbalances arising between supply and demand are, in most cases, being mitigated through international economic assistance. The adverse effects of natural and man-made disasters on national economies are likewise being mitigated through the potential of the global economy. The formation of a global economic assistance mechanism was most clearly manifested during the coronavirus pandemic. In this period, there was an increase not only in humanitarian assistance exchanged among countries but also in the scale of economic and financial support.

In this context, it must first be emphasized that irrational protectionism is gaining momentum globally. The speeches of state leaders, the writings of economists, discussions at economic forums and conferences, and even internationally significant documents repeatedly stress that free trade principles must be prioritized, as only free trade can guarantee economic advancement. In reality, many countries around the world are relying ever more broadly on protectionist measures within their foreign economic policies. The growing trend of irrational protectionism is exacerbating price volatility in the global market. Encouraging the trade of some products while imposing restrictions on others has been a key factor aggravating price instability in the global commodity markets, particularly in raw materials (Ponizovkina & Agibalova, 2020). The structural shifts in the global economy have exerted diverse impacts on its constituent parts, national economies. Although it has markedly accelerated the progress of certain national economies, it has at the same time impeded the comprehensive development of others. Thus, by the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, the disparity in the development rates of national economies further deepened. As states are facing increasing difficulties in managing their national economies, budget deficits are becoming a common phenomenon in all countries.

The complexity of these global processes has generated debates among scholars and policymakers regarding the long-term consequences of globalization. On one hand, open markets, rapid technological transfers, and international investment have allowed developing nations to achieve levels of growth that were unimaginable in previous decades. Countries integrated into global value chains have witnessed modernization in manufacturing, information technology, and infrastructure. On the other hand, dependence on global markets has also exposed these countries to unprecedented vulnerabilities, where external shocks can trigger deep domestic crises. The 2008 financial collapse and the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic vividly demonstrated that national economies, no matter how robust, are inevitably influenced by global fluctuations. Moreover, irrational protectionism has created a paradox in the global

economic order. While leaders publicly advocate free trade, in practice they frequently implement tariffs, subsidies, and non-tariff barriers to shield domestic industries. This contradiction has eroded trust in the multilateral system, weakening institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO). For smaller economies, these dynamics are especially damaging, as they lack the leverage to resist the protectionist measures imposed by larger states. As a result, smaller nations often experience heightened price instability, reduced export opportunities, and slower growth.

The deepening of disparities in economic development rates also underscores the uneven character of globalization. While advanced economies reap disproportionate benefits from global integration, less developed states face persistent challenges, including debt accumulation, weak institutions, and limited technological capacity (Tozhibayev & Isokov, 2022). Budget deficits, now common across many countries, further constrain governments' ability to invest in long-term development projects, often forcing them into cycles of external borrowing. This dynamic increases dependency on international financial institutions and creditor nations, thereby reducing national sovereignty. In light of these realities, the global economy today is characterized by both unprecedented interconnectedness and heightened instability. Policymakers face the dual challenge of harnessing globalization's constructive potential while mitigating its destructive effects (Turdiev, 2024). Achieving this balance requires international cooperation, stronger global governance, and domestic policies that prioritize resilience, equity, and sustainable development.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Conclusion

In conclusion, among the destructive processes that are emerging in modern society not as randomness but as necessity, and that occur as the opposite of constructiveness, economic destruction occupies a central place. Analyses show that today the global economy is witnessing economically destructive processes such as irrational protectionism, high volatility of product and service prices in the world market, the imbalance between the real economy and the global securities market, disparities in the development rates of national economies, the declining ability of states to independently manage their national economies, and the growth of their internal and external debt. These processes are undermining the stability and development of the global economy and increasing the risk of economic and financial crises. The above-identified forms of economic destruction of a global nature are also manifesting themselves in our country's economy.

At the same time, it is important to note that these destructive tendencies do not operate in isolation but are closely linked with political, social, and technological transformations. The weakening of national economic sovereignty, the spread of speculative financial instruments, and the growing dependence on external borrowing not only threaten economic stability but also erode public trust in institutions. For Uzbekistan, as for many developing states, this underscores the necessity of adopting balanced strategies that strengthen resilience, diversify the economy, and integrate social protection mechanisms to shield vulnerable populations. Moreover, the recognition of economic destruction as a systemic phenomenon points to the need for international cooperation, as no country can fully insulate itself from global risks. By combining internal reforms with constructive global engagement, it is possible to mitigate destructive forces and transform them into opportunities for sustainable and equitable development.

5.2 Suggestion

- a. **Diversify the Economy**
Reduce dependence on a limited number of sectors by developing agriculture, industry, services, and technology in a balanced way to strengthen resilience against global economic shocks.
- b. **Strengthen National Economic Sovereignty**
Enhance state capacity to regulate key economic sectors, improve fiscal discipline, and develop mechanisms to reduce reliance on excessive external borrowing.
- c. **Promote Sustainable Trade Policies**

Avoid irrational protectionism by adopting transparent and balanced trade policies that support competitiveness while safeguarding national interests.

- d. Develop Social Protection Systems
Expand social safety nets, employment programs, and targeted subsidies to minimize the negative impacts of economic destruction on vulnerable populations.
- e. Enhance Financial Market Stability
Implement stronger regulatory frameworks for securities markets, reduce speculative activities, and align financial growth with the development of the real economy.
- f. Encourage Regional and Global Cooperation
Participate actively in international economic forums and regional initiatives to collectively address global risks such as price volatility, debt crises, and financial instability.
- g. Invest in Human Capital
Improve education, skills training, and innovation capacity to ensure that citizens can adapt to rapid economic and technological transformations.

References

- Akter, S. (2024). Global Perspectives on the Social Impacts of Artificial Intelligence: A Comparative Review of Regional Inequalities and Cultural Contexts. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence General science (JAIGS)* ISSN:3006-4023, 5, 400-423. doi:<https://doi.org/10.60087/jaigs.v5i1.215>
- Arndt, S. W. (1997). Globalization and the open economy. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, 8(1), 71-79. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1062-9408\(97\)90020-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1062-9408(97)90020-6)
- Batko, M. (2013). *The real economy and the finance economy*: BookRix.
- Brummitt, C. D., Huremović, K., Pin, P., Bonds, M. H., & Vega-Redondo, F. (2017). Contagious disruptions and complexity traps in economic development. *Nature human behaviour*, 1(9), 665-672. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0190-6>
- Celikates, R., & Flynn, J. (2023). Critical theory (Frankfurt school).
- Cîrdei, I. (2019). The Impact of Globalization on the Security Environment. *International conference KNOWLEDGE-BASED ORGANIZATION*, 25, 40-46. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2478/kbo-2019-0006>
- Cortina Issue Editor, M. (2024). Prologue: Erich Fromm's Relevance for Our Troubled World. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 44(1), 1-8. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/07351690.2024.2296336>
- David, L. (2019). Is modernization really unique in the history of human development (or just another approach that will self-destruct)? *Journal of Globalization Studies*, 10(1), 27-43.
- Endi, A. C., Faggidae, R. E., & Ndoen, W. M. (2023). The effect of religiosity and spirituality on financial behavior district. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 1(1), 45-53. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v1i1.1455>
- Garlitz, D., & Zompetti, J. (2023). Critical theory as Post-Marxism: The Frankfurt School and beyond. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 55(2), 141-148. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2021.1876669>
- Han, Y., Qiu, J., Shi, C., Huang, S., Huang, H., Wang, X., . . . Zeng, F. (2025). Factors Associated With Digital Addiction: Umbrella Review. *JMIR Ment Health*, 12, e66950. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2196/66950>
- Hassan, A. O. (2023). Political Instability and Institutional Weakness: A Study of Administrative Corruption in Mogadishu-Somaliaâ€™â€™. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 7(9), 1676-1689. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRIS.2023.71035>
- Hu, Q., Liu, Q., & Wang, Z. (2022). Meaning in life as a mediator between interpersonal alienation and smartphone addiction in the context of Covid-19: A three-wave longitudinal study. *Comput Human Behav*, 127, 107058. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.107058>
- Jeanne, L., Bourdin, S., Nadou, F., & Noiret, G. (2023). Economic globalization and the COVID-19 pandemic: global spread and inequalities. *GeoJournal*, 88(1), 1181-1188. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-022-10607-6>
- Jewett, R. L., Mah, S. M., Howell, N., & Larsen, M. M. (2021). Social Cohesion and Community Resilience During COVID-19 and Pandemics: A Rapid Scoping Review to Inform the United

- Nations Research Roadmap for COVID-19 Recovery. *Int J Health Serv*, 51(3), 325-336. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0020731421997092>
- Kalashnikov, A. O., Konopleva, N. G., & Danilin, K. P. (2023). Rare earths of the Murmansk Region, NW Russia: minerals, extraction technologies and value. *Applied Earth Science*, 132(1), 52-61. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/25726838.2022.2153000>
- Latunusa, P. M., Timuneno, T., & Fanggidae, R. E. (2023). The effect of multiple role conflict and work stress on the performance of women nurses during the covid-19 with coping stress as intervening variables (Study at SoE Regional General Hospital). *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 1(1), 29-43. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v1i1.1462>
- Liu, Y., Cao, L., Yang, D., & Anderson, B. C. (2022). How social capital influences community resilience management development. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 136, 642-651. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2022.07.028>
- Lombardozzi, L., & Djanibekov, N. (2021). Can self-sufficiency policy improve food security? An inter-temporal assessment of the wheat value-chain in Uzbekistan. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 62(1), 1-20. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/15387216.2020.1744462>
- Mamun, S. A. A., Islam, M. M., Okely, A. D., & Hossain, M. S. (2022). Rapid and unplanned urbanization in the least developed districts of Bangladesh: A case study from Jamalpur using geospatial techniques. *Discover Sustainability*, 3(1), 42. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-022-00110-w>
- Marcuse, H. (2003). Eros and Civilization. One Dimensional Man. *Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Moscow, AST Publ.
- Pabbajah, M. (2024). Religious Disorientation in the Digital Transformation: An Islamic Review *Advances in Digital Transformation-Rise of Ultra-Smart Fully Automated Cyberspace*: IntechOpen.
- Ponizovkina, I., & Agibalova, E. (2020). *Human Integrity as Modern Socio-Philosophical Problem*. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Contemporary Education, Social Sciences and Humanities-Philosophy of Being Human as the Core of Interdisciplinary Research (ICCESSH 2020).
- Putra, M. F., Ahadiyat, A., & Keumalahayati, K. (2023). The influence of leadership style on performance with motivation as mediation (study on employees of Metro City Trade Services during pandemi). *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 1(1), 15-27. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v1i1.1536>
- Rahu, K. Y. d., Neolaka, M. N. B. C., & Djaha, A. S. A. (2023). Personnel management information system in order to create up-to-date and integrated personel data and information in the personnel and human resources agency in malaka regency. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 1(1), 55-70. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v1i1.1449>
- Reitz, C. (2021). Herbert Marcuse Today: On Ecological Destruction, Neofascism, White Supremacy, Hate Speech, Racist Police Killings, and the Radical Goals of Socialism. *Theory Cult Soc*, 38(7-8), 87-106. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764211050673>
- Rumyantsev, M. (2012). The economy of postmodern society: a critical analysis. *Christian reading*(6), 165-182.
- Seti, T. M., Mazwane, S., & Christian, M. (2025). Financial openness, trade openness, and economic growth nexus: A dynamic panel analysis for emerging and developing economies. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 18(2), 78. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm18020078>
- Silke, A., & Morrison, J. (2022). Gathering Storm: An Introduction to the Special Issue on Climate Change and Terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 34(5), 883-893. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2022.2069444>
- Sobhaninia, S. (2024). The Social Cohesion Measures Contributing to Resilient Disaster Recovery: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 39(4), 519-534. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/08854122241238196>
- Spartak, A., & Frantsuzov, V. (2019). Modern trends and risks in the development of the world economy. *Russian Foreign Economic Bulletin*(2), 7-24.
- Stahl, B. C., & Eke, D. (2024). The ethics of ChatGPT – Exploring the ethical issues of an emerging technology. *International journal of information management*, 74, 102700. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102700>

- Stevenson, N. (2022). Herbert Marcuse as a Critical Intellectual: The New Left and Alternative Socialist Futures. *Rethinking Marxism*, 34, 81-98. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2022.2026753>
- Suci, S. C., Asmara, A., & Mulatsih, S. (2015). The impact of globalization on economic growth in ASEAN. *Bisnis & Birokrasi*, 22(2), 79. doi:<https://doi.org/10.20476/jbb.v22i2.5696>
- Telford, A. (2023). Where to draw the line? Climate change-conflict-migration-terrorism causal relations and a contested politics of implication. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 141, 138-145. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2023.01.001>
- Tiimub, B. M., Christophé, N., Atepre, B. A., Tiimob, R. W., Tiimob, G. L., Tiimob, E. N., . . . Agyenta, J. J. (2023). Crop production potential of reclaimed mine sites for sustainable livelihoods. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 1(1), 1-13. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v1i1.1785>
- Tozhibayev, B., & Isokov, S. (2022). *Youth Social Deviation in the Process of Reforms in Uzbekistan*. Paper presented at the IX International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Problems of Social and Labour Relations"(ISPC-CPSLR 2021).
- Trynyak, M., Tykhonovych, V., Skinder, N., Torianik, I., Rezenkina, N., & Teterina, T. (2020). Modern Challenges of Globalization Processes and Intercultural Communication As an Answer to Them. *ScienceRise*(3 (68)), 36-42.
- Tsagae, N. (2023). Political Instability: An Impediment to Good Governance in Local Government—The Case of Selected Municipalities in South Africa. *Journal of Public Administration*, 58(2), 430-445. doi:<https://doi.org/10.53973/jopa.2023.58.2.a14>
- Turdiev, B. (2024). Building A Future: The Role Of Culture In New Uzbekistan’S Ideosphere. *Академические исследования в современной науке*, 3(31), 171-176.
- Балаганский, С. (2012). Реальный сектор экономики как объект экономического анализа. *Промышленность: экономика, управление, технологии*(1 (40)), 9-12.