

**Slyusar Vadym**

*Doctor of Philosophical Sciences,  
Docent, Head of the Department of Philosophical and Historical Studies and Mass Communications  
Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5593-0622>*

**Slyusar Mykola**

*assistant of the Department of International Relations and Political Management  
Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1480-1111>*

**Volkova Kateryna**

*postgraduate Student of the Department of International Relations and Political Management  
Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University (Zhytomyr, Ukraine)*

**Terror and war in socio-political processes**

---

**Abstract.** Terror and war are forms of social violence that determine processes in the political sphere and are not only tools of political struggle, but also a source of social change. Emphasis is placed on the basic differences of the concepts of «war», «terror», «terrorism» and the peculiarities of their definition in modern scientific and public discourses are indicated. The article analyzes the functional nature of terror and war and their manifestations at the individual and collective levels of social violence in its following forms: political, economic, physical, structural and systemic. War and terror, in fact, turn out to be a universal tool for the cyclical change of certain forms of violence, in particular «mythical», «existential» and «rational» violence. War and terror in their classical sense are always realized as a physical form of violence. Even under the conditions of minimizing the number of victims in the conditions of the superiority of the military force of the army of one of the parties, military violence constitutes a threat of the use of physical force, and the threat of violence is, in fact, violence. Political goals determine the attitude of each member of society to war, the nature of armed struggle, the choice and mobilization of resources for its success. This determines the content of the law on the dependence of the course of war and its outcome on the political goals of the parties opposing each other. The achievement of a political goal is «marked» in the public consciousness as a "victory", and the image of the defeated is Girard's «victim», on whom aggression is directed, whose level in society usually rises with the beginning of military operations.

**Keywords:** violence; terror; war; terrorism; political process; public discourse; genocide.

---

**Actuality.** The historical events of the last decade revealed the total inability of consolidated humanity to resist terror from organized social groups and states. The activities of international institutions, the functional purpose of which is to support peace at the global and local levels, are subject to meaningful criticism from many actors. Security factors, firstly, built on the mutual balance of the politics of the poles of a bipolar world, and secondly, which should deter potential subjects of terror and aggression from the intention of using violence due to the large resource consumption, are losing their effectiveness. This is explained by a change in the purpose of terror and war as forms of social violence, since by the 19th century they were mainly means of resolving the conflict between two parties, in the 20th century – means of resolving social conflicts. In the second half of the 20th century it appears in new forms, which are fixed in the concepts of «cultural war», «ideological war», «economic war», «cold» war and «nuclear arms race». Nowadays, «cyber war» and «cyber terrorism», «information war», «hybrid war» are also appearing. The latest connotations confirm the tendency to change the content of violence as a qualitative characteristic of modern human existence in general, and socio-political processes in particular. At the same time, war as armed aggression remains one of the tools of international relations, and terrorist war acquires transnational and global dimensions. Terror, which means total violence against certain social groups, is still present at various stages of social transformations, especially during political crises. The analysis of the internal consequences of war and terror in socio-political processes allows us to understand the mechanisms of the formation of power relations and the role of relevant institutions in them.

**The purpose** of the article is to clarify the specifics of the manifestation of terror and war as forms of violence in the context of socio-political processes.

**The degree of research of the problem.** The problems of war and terror as forms of violence were and remain a topical subject of research in political and philosophical sciences. Attempts are being made to systematically analyze violence as a social phenomenon and the forms of its manifestations in an interdisciplinary plane, in particular in the collective monographs «Violence: trends, structures, problems of analysis» (edited by V. Heitmeyer and H.-G. Zöffner) [4], «International Handbook of Violence» (ed. by W. Heitmeyer and J. Hagan) [4], «Violence: An Interdisciplinary Handbook» (ed. by K. Gudeus and M. Christ) [1]. An important scientific achievement on the mentioned problem is the definition of the content and forms of violence, as well as the role of the will as its tool in the context of the study of the problems of war by H. Hofmeister [5]. The problem of violence is the subject of research of Ukrainian scientists. Violence as a subject of philosophical reflections is revealed in the writings of V. Ostroukhov [8]. The peculiarities of violence in the 20th century and the analysis of modern searches for ways to overcome it are the subject of P. Saukh's monographs «The 20th century. Conclusions» [8] and V. Slyusar «Violence: socio-philosophical nature» [20: 8].

**Presenting main material.** War and terror are an important aspect for studying indicators of changing forms of violence. The famous Prussian theorist of war K. von Clausewitz defined war as an act of violence, which aims to force the opponent to fulfill the will of the subject [8]. The history of mankind is a constant alternation of wars both between states and between individual social groups. War and terror can be considered as a type of violence, as a socio-political phenomenon, an exclusive form of solving socio-political, ideological, economic, territorial, ethno-national, religious or other contradictions between states, peoples, nations, governments, communities or paramilitary groups, which occurs with the help of organized armed struggle [13]. A distinctive feature of the war on terror is that it is carried out by a special social institution (army) or armed formations. Political terror is characterized by intimidation of a political opponent and his supporters, killing of the most active political figures of the opposing party, intimidation of others; intimidation of one's own population, its complete suppression and enslavement, and at the same time the destruction of those who fight against the tyrannical state; breaking the fighting spirit of the enemy and terrorizing the population of the opposing side, with the aim of suppressing resistance; by intimidation to displace another nation, to take away its power, sometimes to seize its property and land [15, p. 11]. The concept of terror differs from «terrorism» in that it denotes primarily legitimate violence, which is aimed at imposing on members of society the forms of life, worldview, behavior, moral values and norms required by the ruling elites of a non-democratic state [17]. That is, even in the case of a lost war or a change of political regime, the organizers of war or terror may not be subject to criminal prosecution. While against terrorist activity, the state develops a criminal policy aimed at forming a complex of measures to identify terrorist crimes, search for guilty persons and a system of punishment [13, p. 152]. Another problem in the interpretation of concepts is the influence on the scientific discourse of political actors. Since "war" and "terror" have negative connotations in public discourse, their organizers replace them with chameleon words that are at one pole of the semantic field, but have a different morphological form. Thus, A. Tyushka proposes to stimulate the late discussion on the conceptual difference between the paradigms of «crisis», «conflict» and «war» in academic and political discourses about Russia's war against Ukraine [11]. It should be noted that such «chameleons» in relation to war and terror are «special military operation», «fulfilment of international duty», «crisis», «tough policy», «policy of a strong hand». Such a change of concepts and verbal-legal equilibrium in the mass consciousness does not cause a critical reaction, justifies the actions of the organizers, affects the objectivity of research in the scientific field.

Given that the term «war» contains legal connotations, its use in the system of international law actualizes the need to define clear criteria, primarily by the number of casualties, duration, territory of hostilities, etc. Given that there are significant disputes in scientific circles regarding the content of this concept, especially recently in connection with the spread both in research literature and in the mass media of the use of the concepts «hybrid war», «asymmetric war» and «special military operations alliances of countries» the term «armed clashes» can be used. The understanding of the role of war was reflected in a number of philosophical concepts, in particular in the concept of the «gestalt of the worker» by the German thinker E. Junger. He puts the concept of «war» on a par with such concepts as «worker», «dominion», «gestalt», «mobilization», «race», «species-race», «technique», «new order» and gives them, according to V. Zhmyr, a positive content and filling [15, p. 20]. War and terror as a socio-political phenomenon have an individual dimension. Thus, the opposition peace - war, peace - terror as a component of the «diagnostics of the era» carried out in E. Junger's philosophical reflection should be considered through concepts that continue the categorical series, which originates from ancient Eros. The German philosopher refers to them as «blood», «fire», «horror», «pain». However, only pain is the key to peace, because then peace is actualized as the bearer of the threat. In his writings, E. Junger «masculinizes» and individualizes war, attributing to it male traits and heroic characteristics (courage, self-sacrifice, honor, etc.), which have lost their relevance in modern wars.

The thinker emphasizes the need to realize male, barbaric, physical struggle as an inner experience, where «inner» is thought in the context of Nietzschean «awareness» ("Verinnerlichung"), and experience as a spiritualization and sublimation of struggle. Thus, war appears as a transformation, a return, a regression to the

barbaric form of human existence, it is this wild essence of man that is the root cause of wars. However, the beginning of the war, which leads to the death of civilization, is accompanied at the same time by the process of the birth of a «new man», and therefore, the beginning of a new era, a new civilization, but more precisely, a new cycle of its development. One of the features of the «new man» is his total identification with technology and the generation of deep instincts, passions, and reflexes. The logic of the study of war in social transformations involves the analysis of the content and nature of this phenomenon depending on the forms of social violence that determine the direction of their course. In our previous works, considering the typology of forms of violence by subject and direction (self-directed, interpersonal and collective violence), we came to the conclusion that the first two forms have an indirect effect on social transformations. Self-directed and interpersonal violence in this context is carried out, firstly, as a provocation that can cause the beginning of structural transformation processes, and, secondly, as a typicality that becomes mass [21, p. 131]. Therefore, we will focus on collective violence, although it is more appropriate to use the term «social violence» here.

Social violence is expressed in political, economic and collective forms, and depending on the presence of the subject of action (actor) and, accordingly, the nature of the social manifestation, physical, structural and systemic forms can be distinguished. The analysis of war as one of the tools of the political form of violence should begin with two approaches to defining its role. In philosophical and political thought, the position proposed by K. Clausewitz and continued in various interpretations by K. Marx, F. Engels, and K. Kautsky was formed, that war is a continuation of politics by other means. Such an absolutization of the instrumental role of war in socio-political processes was denied by V. Lenin, who pointed out, in the context of the proclaimed idea of class struggle, the opposite to the political function of war. Theoretically, he tried to justify the thesis that with the beginning of the war, historically prepared political relations between peoples and classes cease, a completely different situation arises, which is based on the antonymy «attacker – defender». This leads to the sublimation of the energy of social tension, including in political processes, into the struggle for survival.

H. Hofmeister, denying the ontological political essence of war, proclaimed by K. Clausewitz, notes that war in general is an expression of political anarchy, and military violence, unlike the police, which functions within the state, goes beyond the space regulated by national legislation [8]. War, in fact, does not have a creative nature, that is, there is no war for the sake of war, it is primarily instrumental in nature. Rather, it is worth talking about the political goals of the war, declared by the authorities (the political and military leadership of the state) as the final result of the use of military violence. Political goals determine the attitude of each member of society to war, the nature of armed struggle, the choice and mobilization of resources for its success. This determines the content of the law on the dependence of the course of war and its outcome on the political goals of the parties opposing each other. The achievement of a political goal is «marked» in the public consciousness as a «victory», and the image of the defeated is a Girard's «victim», on whom aggression is directed, whose level in society usually rises with the beginning of military operations. Thus, hatred of the defeated becomes an integral factor in the development of society, which affects the processes of relegitimization of violence. Regarding the relationship between war and the economic form of violence, it is worth noting, agreeing with E. Toffler and H. Toffler, that war from the conflicts of states or ruling dynasties has turned into violence organized by nations, where the state manages a single economy on a national scale [8]. This allowed the authorities to concentrate economic and material resources for large-scale wars, to mobilize the population thanks to communication systems (transportation and information). The economic form of violence allowed military violence to move from the collective level, limited to the activities of groups of military professionals, to the extreme, involving also mobilized military and civilian workers who work at facilities that support the functioning of military-economic complexes.

In the work «The work of art in the age of its technical reproducibility» («Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit»), W. Benjamin analyzes the phenomenon of war as a form of economic violence from the standpoint of technology, arguing that only war is able to mobilize all modern technical means, preserving traditional property relations [1]. That is, it is natural to inhibit the utilization of the productive forces of the existing property system, but in the process of development of technical means, with the growth of energy capacities, it causes the unnatural use of these productive forces, unnatural utilization due to war. According to W. Benjamin, the destruction that takes place during the war is proof for all of humanity that technology is not yet sufficiently developed to control spontaneous social forces.

War and terror in their classical sense are always realized as a physical form of violence. Even under the conditions of minimizing the number of victims in the conditions of the superiority of the military force of the army of one of the parties, military violence constitutes a threat of the use of physical force, and the threat of violence is, in fact, violence. The structural form of violence largely, though not completely, denies war as its tool, but only in such connotations of the interpretation of this concept as «direct violence». Other types and forms of war, on the contrary, due to their reliance on specialized structural organizations that function primarily on the principles of clarity and unconditional subordination, play an instrumental role in structural violence as well. As history shows, the violence of social inequality and injustice, which is structural, is supported by military violence as a way of threatening to prevent the destruction of established structures. A direct form of military violence as a

component of structural violence is usually carried out in the early stages of establishing new social structures. This is expressed in mass terror, genocide, artificial famines for certain regions. And also, to support the functioning of existing structures. The latter is implemented as «military operations» outside the state, the need for which is explained by government organizations or peacekeeping (prevention of local military conflicts between armed groups), or prevention of the activities of foreign organizations that pose a threat to the functioning of the society structure (e.g., terrorist organizations), or protection of national, primarily economic, interests. On the one hand, such «military operations» are able to form in the public mind the idea that the existing social structure and the violence that is implemented through it are the most optimal for society, and on the other hand, the image of a military hero is produced, which accumulates the activities of Humil's «passionaries», directing it at the same time on external transformations.

The success of waging war or organized terror directly depends on the clarity of the structural subordination of military organizations and the subordination of public organizations to the military. In recent decades, the scale of activities of terrorist organizations, which can be safely defined as supranational, has been marked. Given the difficulties in identifying its structures and composition, the war against international terrorism is extremely complicated. The application by the state under such conditions of its exclusive right to armed violence must be preceded by the identification of structures to which this violence may extend. The assertion of systemic violence, in fact, reveals the meaning and character of modern warfare.

War and terror, in fact, turn out to be a universal tool for the cyclical change of certain forms of violence. First, they are a form of direct violence that simultaneously causes physical, moral and mental harm, is characterized by the scale of the action, allows intensive destruction of established norms, traditions, and rules, which defines it as a component of «mythical» violence. The result of war and terror is the establishment of the values and culture of the victors in the society of the vanquished and the actualization of their reinterpretation by the victors, since the stated goal of the war has been achieved. Secondly, the sacralization of the goals of war and terror involves the simultaneous expression of the charisma of the commander-in-chief and makes it possible to integrate society in the fight against the common enemy against which the intention to wage war is expressed, in fact to direct the energy of the masses into a war of all against one. Thirdly, war and terror are regulators of the critical number of «rebels» (passions) in society during the period of dominance of «rational» violence [20]. In the work «War as inner experience», E. Junger defines war as a father who raised people ready for eternal struggle, because war, according to the philosopher's figurative expression, is the axis of the vibrating wheel of life, which turns in every person, war gives life a form and meaning [7]. Soldiers, who internally experience war, reproduce it in order to create something, which leads to the sanctification of both war and all soldiering. E. Junger, on the one hand, glorifies soldiering, secularizing it to a certain extent, giving it the status of the most important factor in the development of society. However, on the other hand, «inner experience» is an attempt to justify the war, to give it a concrete content, meaning, and outline its necessity. This can be explained primarily by the social and geopolitical processes that took place in Germany in the 20s and 30s of the XX century, in the period between the two world wars, when the idea of war was established not only as a way of resolving conflicts between states, but primarily as a way of existence of a person in a world hostile to her. Hostility is manifested in the mechanization of many spheres of life, the strengthening of the role of natural selection in social processes, the establishment of political means during the resolution of the generational conflict. War, according to E. Junger, is what makes people and their time what they really are, it embodies God - the Creator - Father and Educator, moving to a special level of the holy and divine, which is marked by the birth of a «new man». At the same time, war and terror appear as a ritual of initiation, when a whole generation leaves the «dark» and «gray» life, passes through the gate and goes to the light, hardening, its soldiers feel the war, become its component, passing to the state of martyrs, ready with the deepest convictions to die for war.

Since the second half of the 20th century, the concept of «genocide» as a special practice of terror has been introduced into scientific circulation. Proposed by R. Lemkin in the work «Axis Rule in Occupied Europe» in 1944, this term immediately became widespread in scientific, political and legal circles, and was reflected in international law, in particular in 1948 The United Nations adopted the «Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide and its Punishment», and legal acts and documents of many countries. Of course, genocide as a form of policy aimed at the destruction of the cultural and economic foundations of the existence of certain groups, primarily national (although it can also be based on class and status, for example, in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge regime), and the destruction of these groups themselves, in fact, it can be classified as a type of crime, and therefore it can be committed even in «peacetime». However, let's agree with M. Shaw, who noted that in fact genocide, although it has long historical antecedents, it appears as a new modern form of war and terror for extermination [8]. The history of the 20th century contains examples of genocide, which was carried out in the context of a civil war (in particular, the genocide of Ukrainians by the Soviet authorities (Holodomor), of the Cambodians by the «Khmer Rouge» regime in 1975–1979, of the Hutus by the Tutsi people in Rwanda in 1994), as well as with regard to another state (in particular, the genocide of Jews and Roma by the German Nazis in World War II, Bosnians by the Serbs in the Bosnian War, the question of qualifying crimes against the Ukrainian civilian population in the territories occupied by the Russians as genocide also arises). Moreover, in the second case, the

object of violence can also be social communities stigmatized as the «enemy» within a society that is waging a war or operating a policy of terror. On the other hand, domestic policies aimed at the physical destruction of certain communities can be qualified as genocide, in particular, the policies of Stalin in the USSR and Mao Zedong in the People's Republic of China can be classified as such. Genocide in this context can be seen as an instrument of «mythical», «divine», or «rational» violence. Given the fact that one of the key tasks of «divine» violence is the sacralization of newly established norms and rules, which is carried out through the sociocultural «offering» of a sacred sacrifice, genocide makes it possible, firstly, to mobilize a significant number of the population to fight «all against one». This became possible also due to the change in the principles of warfare in the 19th–20th centuries, according to which a military campaign involves broad physical, economic, social, cultural and ideological mobilization. War as a type of social violence, characterized by the organization of struggle, the use of weapons, is carried out by a special social institution (army) or armed formations with the involvement of economic, political, ideological and diplomatic means and is implemented at the individual and collective levels. War as an individual form of social violence is based on the need to realize masculine, barbaric, physical struggle as an inner experience, where «inner» is thought in the context of Nietzschean «awareness» («Verinnerlichung»), and experience as spiritualization and sublimation of struggle. At the collective level, violence is realized in political, economic, and collective forms. In its political form, war is a continuation of politics by other means (K. Clausewitz) or a method of ending historically prepared political relations between peoples and classes (V. Lenin). The result of the war is hatred of the defeated, which becomes an integral factor in the development of society, affecting the processes of relegitimization of violence. In the economic form of violence, there is a transition of military violence from the collective level, limited by the activities of groups of military professionals, to the meta-level due to the involvement of mobilized military and civilian workers who work at facilities that support the functioning of military-economic complexes. The direct form of military violence is a component of structural violence and is carried out either in the early stages of establishing new social structures (expressed in mass terror, genocide, artificial famines for certain regions), or to support the functioning of existing structures («military operations» outside the state for the purpose of peacekeeping, preventing the activities of foreign organizations that pose a threat to the functioning of the structure of society, the protection of national, primarily economic, interests).

**Conclusions.** War is an instrument of cyclical change in forms of violence. War, as a component of «mythical» violence, is characterized by the scale of action, which makes it possible to intensively destroy established norms, traditions, and rules. The sacralization of the goals of war in «transcendent» violence involves the simultaneous expression of the charisma of the commander-in-chief and allows to integrate society in the fight against a common enemy, to direct the energy of the masses to the war of all against one. War is a regulator of the critical number of «rebels» (passionaries) in society during the period of dominance of «rational» violence.

Irrational foundations of war and terror were ignored. They will be the subject of our further research.

#### Список використаної літератури:

1. Benjamin W. Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit (dritte, autorisierte letzte Fassung, 1939) / W.Benjami // Medienästhetische Schriften ; herausgegeben von Detlev Schöttker. – Frankfurt am Main : Suhrkamp Verlag, 2002. – P. 351–383.
2. Fitzpatrick M.P. Theorising the history of violence after Pinker / M.P. Fitzpatrick, C.Kevin // Rethinking History. – 2021. – № 24 (3–4). – P. 332–350 [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642529.2020.1847897>.
3. Gewalt: Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch / hrsg. C.Gudehus, M.Chris. – Stuttgart, Weimar : Verlag J.B. Metzler, 2013. – 428 p.
4. Gewalt: Entwicklungen, Strukturen, Analyseprobleme / hrsg. H.-G. Soeffner, W.Heitmeyer. – 3rd edition. – Frankfurt a. M. : Suhrkamp Verlag, 2004. – 560 p.
5. Hofmeister H. Der Wille zum Krieg oder Die Ohnmacht der Politik : Ein philosophisch-politischer Traktat / H.Hofmeister. – Göttingen : Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2001. – 160 p.
6. Internationales Handbuch der Gewaltforschung / hrsg. J.Hagan, W.Heitmeyer. – Wiesbaden : Westdeutscher Verlag, 2002. – 1583 p.
7. Junger E. Der Kampf als inneres Erlebnis : sämtliche Werke / E.Junger. – 1. Aufl. – Stuttgart : Klett-Cotta, 1980. – B. 7. – P. 9–103.
8. Political institutions of parliamentarism in the processes of constituting the lokal church of Ukraine / A.Kobetyak, V.Slyusar, O.Yevchenko, Y.Kondratyuk // AD ALTA: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research. – 2023. – Vol. 13, Issue1, Special XXXIV. – P. 172–176.
9. Shaw M. War and Genocide: A Sociological Approach / M.Shaw // Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <http://www.massviolence.org/War-andGenocide-A-Sociological-Approach>.
10. Toffler A. War and Anti-War: survival at the dawn of the 21st century / A.Toffler, H.Toffler. – London : Warner Books, 1995. – 370 p.
11. Tyushka A. In 'crisis' we trust? On (un)intentional knowledge distortion and the exigency of terminological clarity in academic and political discourses on Russia's war against Ukraine / A.Tyushka // Journal of International Relations

- and Development. – 2023. – № 26. – P. 643–659 [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-023-00313-2>.
12. *Vom Kriege* Hinterlassenes Werk des Generals Carl von Clausewitz, bei Ferdinand Dümmler / *Kriege Vom* ; hrsg. von M. Clausewitz. – Berlin, 1832–1834. – Bd. 1–3 [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <https://clausewitzstudies.org/readings/VomKriege1832/TOC.htm#TOC>.
  13. Грицишен Д.О. Державна політика в сфері запобігання та протидії економічній злочинності / Д.О. Грицишен. – Житомир : Вид. О.О. Євенок, 2020. – 384 с.
  14. Денисов В.Н. Війна. Велика українська енциклопедія / В.Н. Денисов [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <https://vue.gov.ua/%D0%92%D1%96%D0%B9%D0%BD%D0%B0>.
  15. Євдокимов В.В. Ідентифікація властивостей тероризму як загрози національній безпеці / В.В. Євдокимов, І.В. Супрунова, С.П. Лисак // Економічний простір. – 2021. – № 169. – С. 7–12 [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <https://doi.org/10.32782/2224-6282/169-1>.
  16. Жмир В. Ернст Юнгер – хто він? / В.Жмир // Філософська думка. – 2008. – № 1. – С. 15–35.
  17. Кульчицький С.В. Терор і тероризм / С.В. Кульчицький, Я.Л. Примаченко [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Teroryzm>.
  18. Остроухов В. Насилля як предмет філософських рефлексій / В.Остроухов. – Київ : Український Центр духовної культури, 2000. – 92 с.
  19. Саух П.Ю. XX століття. Підсумки (вид. 2-ге, допов. і переробл.) / П.Ю. Саух. – Київ : Леся, 2009. – 283 с.
  20. Слюсар В.М. Насилля: соціально-філософська природа / В.М. Слюсар. – Житомир : Вид-во Євенок О.О., 2017. – 450 с.
  21. Слюсар В.М. Соціальне насилля: зміст і форми реалізації у трансформаційних процесах / В.М. Слюсар // Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка. – 2016. – Вип. 1 (82). – С. 127–132.

#### References:

1. Benjamin, W. (2002), *Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit* (dritte, autorisierte letzte Fassung, 1939), *Medienästhetische Schriften*, in Detlev, Schöttker (ed.), Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 351–383.
2. Fitzpatrick, M.P. and Kevin, C. (2021), «Theorising the history of violence after Pinker», *Rethinking History*, No. 24 (3–4), pp. 332–350, [Online], available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642529.2020.1847897>
3. Gudehus, C. and Chris, M. (ed.) (2013), *Gewalt: Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch*, Verlag J.B. Metzler, Stuttgart, Weimar, 428 p.
4. Soeffner, H.-G. and Heitmeyer, W. (ed.) (2004), *Gewalt: Entwicklungen, Strukturen, Analyseprobleme*, 3rd edition, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt a. M., 560 p.
5. Hofmeister, H. (2001), *Der Wille zum Krieg oder Die Ohnmacht der Politik*, Ein philosophisch-politischer Traktat, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen, 160 p.
6. Hagan, J. and Heitmeyer, W. (2002), *Internationales Handbuch der Gewaltforschung*, Westdeutscher Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1583 p.
7. Junger, E. (1980), *Der Kampf als inneres Erlebnis*, sämtliche Werke, 1. Aufl, Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart, B. 7, pp. 9–103.
8. Kobetyak, A., Sliusar, V., Yevchenko, O. and Kondratyuk, Y. (2023), «Political institutions of parliamentarism in the processes of constituting the lokal church of Ukraine», *AD ALTA: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, Vol. 13, Issue 1, Special XXXIV, pp. 172–176.
9. Shaw, M., «War and Genocide: A Sociological Approach», *Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence*, [Online], available at: <http://www.massviolence.org/War-and-Genocide-A-Sociological-Approach>
10. Toffler, A. and Toffler, H. (1995), *War and Anti-War: survival at the dawn of the 21st century*, Warner Books, London, 370 p.
11. Tyushka, A. (2023), «In ‘crisis’ we trust? On (un)intentional knowledge distortion and the exigency of terminological clarity in academic and political discourses on Russia’s war against Ukraine», *Journal of International Relations and Development*, No. 26, pp. 643–659, [Online], available at: <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-023-00313-2>
12. *Vom Kriege* (1832–1834), *Hinterlassenes Werk des Generals Carl von Clausewitz, bei Ferdinand Dümmler*, in Clausewitz, M., Berlin, Bd. 1–3, [Online], available at: <https://clausewitzstudies.org/readings/VomKriege1832/TOC.htm#TOC>
13. Hrytsyshen, D.O. (2020), *Derzhavna polityka v sferi zapobihannia ta protydyi ekonomichnii zlochynnosti*, Vyd. Yevenok O.O., Zhytomyr, 384 p.
14. Denysov, V.N., «Viina. Velyka ukrainska entsyklopediia», [Online], available at: <https://vue.gov.ua/%D0%92%D1%96%D0%B9%D0%BD%D0%B0>
15. Yevdokymov, V.V., Suprunova, I.V. and Lysak, S.P. (2021), «Ідентифікація властивостей тероризму як загрози національній безпеці», *Економічний простір*, No. 169, pp. 7–12, [Online], available at: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2224-6282/169-1>
16. Zhmyr, V. (2008), «Ernst Yunher – khto vin? », *Filosofska dumka*, No. 1, pp. 15–35.
17. Kulchytskyi, S.V. and Prymachenko, Ya.L., *Teror i teroryzm*, [Online], available at: <http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Teroryzm>
18. Ostroukhov, V. (2000), *Nasyllia yak predmet filozofskykh refleksii*, Ukrainnyi Tsentr dukhovnoi kultury, Kyiv, 92 p.
19. Saukh, P.Iu. (2009), *XX stolittia. Pidsumky*, vyd. 2-e, dopov. i pererobl., Lesia, Kyiv, 283 p.
20. Sliusar, V.M. (2017), *Nasyllia: sotsialno-filosofska pryroda*, Vyd-vo Yevenok O.O., Zhytomyr, 450 p.
21. Sliusar, V.M. (2016), «Sotsialne nasyllia: zmist i formy realizatsii u transformatsiinykh protsesakh», *Visnyk Zhytomyrskoho derzhavnogo universytetu imeni Ivana Franka*, Issue. 1 (82), pp. 127–132.

---

**Слюсар В., Слюсар М., Волкова К.**

**Терор та війна в суспільно-політичних процесах**

**Анотація.** Терор та війна – форми соціального насилля, які детермінують процеси у політичній сфері, виступають не лише інструментами політичної боротьби, а й джерелом суспільних змін. Акцентовано на базових відмінностей понять «війна», «терор», «тероризм» та вказано на особливості їх означення в сучасних науковому та публічному дискурсах. У статті проаналізовано функціональний характер терору та війни та їх вияви на індивідуальному та колективному рівнях соціального насилля у таких його формах: політичній, економічній, фізичній, структурній і системній. Війна та терор, по суті, виявляються універсальним інструментом циклічної зміни певних форм насилля, зокрема «міфічного», «екзистенційного» та «раціонального» насилля. Війна та терор в їх класичному розумінні завжди реалізуються як фізична форма насилля. Навіть за умов мінімізації кількості жертв в умовах переважання військової сили армії однієї зі сторін військове насилля становить загрозу застосування фізичної сили, а загроза насилля і є, власне, насиллям. Політичні цілі визначають ставлення кожного члена суспільства до війни, характер збройної боротьби, вибір і мобілізацію ресурсів для її успіху. Це визначає зміст закону залежності ходу війни та її результату від політичних цілей сторін, які протистоять одна одній. Досягнення політичної мети «маркується» у суспільній свідомості як «перемога», а образ переможеного – жирарівською «жертвою», на яку спрямовується агресія, чий рівень у суспільстві, зазвичай, підвищується з початком військових дій.

**Ключові слова:** насилля; терор; війна; тероризм; політичний процес; публічний дискурс; геноцид.

---

Стаття надійшла до редакції 08.11.2023