

The socio-philosophical interpretation of economic destructions

Bekmurodova Gulshoda Khaitovna

Qarshi State University, Uzbekistan

Bekmurodovagulshoda77@gmail.com



Article History:

Received on 20 August 2025

1st Revision on 27 August 2025

Accepted on 3 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), 259-269.

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 negative and destructive conditions. Social destruction manifests in economic, political, social, and spiritual forms (Lombardozi & Djanibekov, 2021). The emergence of the global economy has resulted in 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 connections to other economies. In nearly all countries, open-type economies have emerged, characterized by diverse

interactions with others and development in harmony with them, alongside accelerating and intensifying interconnectedness among national economies (Seti, Mazwane, & Christian, 2025; Suci, Asmara, & Mulatsih, 2015).

The multidimensionality of social destruction requires a careful analysis. From an economic perspective, destructive processes may emerge during financial crises, unemployment, inflation, and sharp disparities between different social groups. While globalization expands opportunities for cooperation, it can also deepen inequality when the benefits of interconnectedness are unevenly distributed. 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 economic 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 as instability, corruption, weakening of governance structures, and erosion of democratic norms (Hassan, 2023; Tsagae, 2023). As globalization intensifies, states face challenges in balancing their 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 governments' capacity to manage change constructively. In the social sphere, destruction appears through the disintegration of traditional communities, decline of solidarity, and 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, decline in social capital, and rising levels of crime and substance abuse are symptoms of deeper social challenges. While modernization offers new forms of communication and lifestyle, it simultaneously weakens the conventional norms and values that previously provided stability.

Although less visible, spiritual destruction may be the most profound. It involves the weakening of moral values, ethical disorientation, and the rise of cynicism in the workplace. In many societies, consumerism and materialism dominate, overshadowing traditional, spiritual, and cultural values (Pabbajah, 2024). This shift has contributed to a sense of emptiness and loss of meaning, particularly among younger generations (David, 2019). When spiritual foundations erode, societies' capacity 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 change. The expansion of trade, technological innovation, and cultural exchange promotes mutual understanding and cooperation among countries. Interconnected economies share not only risks but also knowledge and innovations that can improve the 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 their education systems. These constructive elements demonstrate that globalization, while potentially destructive, provides tools for progress if managed responsibly.

The interplay between constructive and destructive processes is systemic, not accidental. As new opportunities arise, so too do new risks also arise. For instance, the digital revolution has expanded access to information and education, but it has also created 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 and safeguards. One critical dimension of contemporary globalization is the increasing 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 the rise of protectionism. Although free trade has been a cornerstone of globalization, many countries have resorted 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 (Omilovna, 2024). Moreover, protectionist policies can exacerbate tensions between states, fueling conflicts that spill over into other spheres of society and the economy. Price volatility in global markets—particularly for energy and food—further complicates the situation, creating uncertainty that undermines economic stability and social well-being.

To counter destructive processes, societies must invest in resilience-building. Economic diversification, social safety nets, and robust legal frameworks are essential for mitigating the negative effects of globalization. Education plays a pivotal role, as it equips individuals with the skills to adapt to technological change and fosters critical thinking that resists ideological manipulation. Similarly, strengthening civil society organizations can enhance social cohesion by providing platforms for dialogue and collective action (Irianto et al., 2024). 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 these destructive trends. When societies share traditions, art, and ideas, they foster mutual respect and appreciation. This cultural interconnectedness can mitigate xenophobia and prejudice and reinforce the 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 undermining identity. The role of technology deserves special attention in this regard. While technological progress is often celebrated as a driver of constructive change, it can amplify destructive tendencies. For instance, automation 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 for exploitation and inequality (Akter, 2024; Stahl & Eke, 2024).

In conclusion, social destruction is an inherent component of modern reality, intertwined with the 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 harm, 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 the tendencies characteristic of post-industrial society, are reflected in the works of Herbert Marcuse and Erich Fromm. Several representatives of the Frankfurt School, building on centuries of theoretical discourse on the subject, formulated different versions of the concept of social destruction. 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 several researchers, has provided reliable theoretical and

methodological foundations for the systematic analysis of processes and factors that undermine stability in contemporary society, hinder development, lead to regression and decline, and create 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 sociopolitical events that occurred in Germany during the first half of the twentieth century. The root of economic decline lies in 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 societies. For this purpose, he first divided the history of human society into three periods: a) pre-industrial society, b) industrial society, and c) post-industrial society. The philosopher maintains that destructive processes were present even in pre-industrial societies. However, during this period, a distinct gap existed between the destructive processes and production efficiency. In an industrial society, by contrast, the gap between destructive processes and production efficiency ceases to exist.

Furthermore, production efficiency itself was propelled by destructive forces, ultimately culminating 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. However, well-being gives rise to the endless production of new irrational needs. Thus, increasing production efficiency inevitably contributes to the further intensification of destructive processes. In an 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, thinkers refer to the social constraints and mechanisms of control that dominate 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 examined. Subsequently, in 1964, the philosopher published his renowned work, “One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society.” The book culminates in the thinker's system of views concerning the concept of social destruction. In his second book, Herbert Marcuse focuses 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 societies.

However, during this period, a distinct imbalance prevailed between destructive processes and production efficiency. In an industrial society, by contrast, the gap between destructive processes and production efficiency ceases to exist. Furthermore, production efficiency itself is fueled by destructive forces and ultimately culminates in destruction. An industrial society initially produces excessive and irrational human needs together with a consumerist mindset and subsequently secures human well-being through their satisfaction. However, well-being perpetually gives rise to new and increasingly irrational needs. Thus, increasing production efficiency continually contributes to the intensification of destructive processes. In an industrial society, this cycle cannot be disrupted, as the interrelation between production efficiency and destruction is sustained by means of additional repression. Through additional repression, thinkers refer to the social constraints and mechanisms of control operating within society (Reitz, 2021).

Based on 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 progress of rationality under modern capitalism

contained the seeds of destruction. Their analysis of the “culture industry” describes how mass media and commodification reduce individuality, creativity, and critical consciousness, turning citizens into passive consumers. This was interpreted as a destructive process because it undermined autonomy and critical thought, which are essential values for 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 lives and meaningful relationships. He highlighted that authoritarian systems, consumerist culture, and economic exploitation drive individuals into despair, leading to aggression, conformity, and destructiveness. According to Fromm, overcoming social destruction requires cultivating the values of love, creativity, and productive work—elements that can restore harmony between the individual and society (Cortina Issue Editor, 2024).

Marcuse deepened this critique by pointing to the integration of repression into the mechanisms of advanced industrial societies. 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 its destructive tendencies. In this sense, destruction is not a marginal effect but a structural characteristic of industrial modernity. Subsequent scholarship has extended these concepts to the study of post-industrial and globalized societies. Researchers have noted that destructive tendencies manifest as 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, their representatives provided a comprehensive framework for analyzing social destruction. This has influenced subsequent critical theories, including neo-Marxist, postmodernist, 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 identity commodification. Notably, 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 envisioned possibilities for liberation through art, radical politics, and the refusal of false needs. Fromm, who was 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 breakdown of social trust. These phenomena reflect destructive processes that transcend national boundaries and require global solutions. The globalization of production and communication intensifies both constructive and destructive dynamics, echoing the Frankfurt School’s recognition that modernity contains contradictory tendencies. Thus, the literature review shows that the intellectual contributions of Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, and Fromm continue to provide fertile foundations for understanding destructive processes in modern societies. Their concepts illuminate how economic structures, political systems, cultural practices, and psychological conditions intertwine to produce stability and instability. Moreover, they highlight the ethical imperative to recognize and resist destructive tendencies, whether manifested in authoritarian politics, consumerist cultures, or ecological exploitation (Silke & Morrison, 2022; Telford, 2023).

In summary, the Frankfurt School’s analysis of social destruction offers a diagnostic tool and 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 contemporary society’s challenges. The continuity of destructive processes from the pre-industrial to the industrial and post-

industrial contexts underscores the universality of these dynamics, whereas the hope for their mitigation points to the enduring relevance of human agency and critical thought. The Frankfurt School's insights 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; however, 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 contemporary 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 and into empirical research. Contemporary scholars employ critical theory to study structural violence, ecological degradation, and the rise of authoritarian populism in the Philippines. 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 logic of global capitalism. From this perspective, mitigating social destruction requires structural changes rather than superficial reforms. Another significant contribution is 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 to cultivate critical awareness, challenge ideological domination, and imagine alternative futures. This orientation has inspired diverse movements, from ecological activism to the struggle 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 is interrelated with the political, cultural, and spiritual dimensions of society (Kalashnikov, Konopleva, & Danilin, 2023; Балаганский, 2012). By analyzing destructive tendencies within a systemic framework, this study 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 (Aliyevna, 2025). Logical consistency is crucial for linking empirical observations to theoretical interpretations. Through coherent reasoning, this study 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 provides a balanced approach: analysis helps to break down complex manifestations of economic destruction, such as unemployment, inequality, and market instability, while synthesis integrates 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 for conclusions to be drawn from local observations and empirical data. Both statistical trends and lived experiences provide valuable evidence of how economic destruction manifests in daily life, influencing employment, social mobility,

and cultural identity. Combined, these methods create 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). *First*, the increasing openness of national economies has brought about unprecedented liberalization of economic activity across countries. Across all regions, state involvement in economic processes has significantly diminished, accompanied by the expansion of the freedom of economic entities. The restrictions and prohibitions that were 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.

Second, 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 economic growth. Indeed, when utilized prudently, this economic and financial potential exerts a profound influence on the rate of economic development in countries. *Third*, the global economy has enabled countries to obtain economic support from others during difficult times. Regional economic crises and the imbalances arising between supply and demand are, in most cases, mitigated through international economic assistance. The adverse effects of natural and man-made disasters on national economies are likewise being mitigated by the potential of the global economy. The formation of a global economic assistance mechanism was most clearly manifested during the coronavirus pandemic. During this period, there was an increase in humanitarian assistance exchanged among countries and the scale of economic and financial support.

In this context, it must first be emphasized that irrational protectionism is gaining momentum. The speeches of state leaders, 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 worldwide are increasingly relying ever more broadly on protectionist measures within their foreign economic policies. The growing trend of irrational protectionism is exacerbating global market price volatility. Encouraging the trade of some products while imposing restrictions on others has been a key factor aggravating price instability in global commodity markets, particularly in raw materials (Ponizovkina & Agibalova, 2020). 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 simultaneously 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 deepened. As states face 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 on the long-term consequences of globalization. On the 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. However, 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, regardless of their robustness, are inevitably influenced by global fluctuations. Moreover, irrational protectionism has created a paradox in the global economic order that must be addressed. While leaders publicly advocate free trade, they frequently implement tariffs, subsidies, and non-tariff barriers to protect 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 protectionist measures imposed by larger states. Consequently, smaller nations often experience heightened price instability, reduced export opportunities, and slower growth.

The deepening of disparities in economic development rates also underscores globalization's uneven character. 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 the national sovereignty. In light of these realities, the global economy is characterized by unprecedented interconnectedness and heightened instability. Policymakers face the dual challenge of harnessing the constructive potential of globalization while mitigating its destructive effects (Turdiev, 2024). Achieving this balance requires international cooperation, stronger global governance, and domestic policies prioritizing 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 a 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, 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 undermine the stability and development of the global economy and increase the risk of economic and financial crises. The above-identified forms of global economic destruction are also manifesting 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 threaten economic stability and 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 protect 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 risk. 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**
Reducing 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**
Enhancing state capacity to regulate key economic sectors, improve fiscal discipline, and develop mechanisms to reduce reliance on excessive external borrowing is crucial.
- 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
Expanding social safety nets, employment programs, and targeted subsidies to minimize the negative impacts of economic destruction on vulnerable populations.
- e. Enhance Financial Market Stability
Stronger regulatory frameworks should be implemented for securities markets, speculative activities should be reduced, and financial growth should be aligned 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
Improving 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>
- Aliyevna, B. S. (2025). Deformation of spiritual values in modern society: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 3(3), 931-941. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v3i3.3497>
- 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., Fanggidae, 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-Somalia. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 7(9), 1676-1689. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.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>

- Irianto, O., Susanto, S., Asmaningrum, H. P., Rachman, A. M., Budiasto, J., & Sokheh, H. (2024). Storybook validation: Essential practices for student's financial literacy. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic Business Studies*, 1(2), 125-138. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jomabs.v1i2.3398>
- 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.
- Omilovna, K. N. (2024). Development of investment activities in the automobile industry of Uzbekistan in the conditions of the digital economy. *Global Academy of Business Studies*, 1(2), 149-159. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/gabs.v1i2.3469>
- 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.