



АНАЛІТИЧНИЙ ЦЕНТР  
СУЧАСНОЇ ГУМАНІТАРИСТИКИ

ВСЕУКРАЇНСЬКА  
НАУКОВО-ПРАКТИЧНА КОНФЕРЕНЦІЯ

# ГЛОБАЛЬНІ ВИКЛИКИ ХХІ СТОЛІТТЯ: МІЖДИСЦИПЛІНАРНІ ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ

29 травня 2026 року, м. Харків, Україна

## С М А Й Б У Т Н Є

У  
Ч  
А  
С  
Н  
І  
С  
Т  
Ь

ІСТОРИЧНІ НАУКИ  
ЕКОНОМІЧНІ НАУКИ  
ФІЛОСОФСЬКІ НАУКИ  
ФІЛОЛОГІЧНІ НАУКИ  
ЮРИДИЧНІ НАУКИ  
ПЕДАГОГІЧНІ НАУКИ  
МИСТЕЦТВОЗНАВСТВО  
ПСИХОЛОГІЧНІ НАУКИ  
НАЦІОНАЛЬНА БЕЗПЕКА  
СОЦІОЛОГІЧНІ НАУКИ  
ПОЛІТИЧНІ НАУКИ  
ДЕРЖАВНЕ УПРАВЛІННЯ  
КУЛЬТУРОЛОГІЯ  
СОЦІАЛЬНІ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ  
МІЖНАРОДНІ ВІДНОСИНИ



АНАЛІТИЧНИЙ ЦЕНТР СУЧАСНОЇ ГУМАНІТАРИСТИКИ  
ХАРКІВСЬКА АСОЦІАЦІЯ ПОЛІТОЛОГІВ

**ГЛОБАЛЬНІ ВИКЛИКИ  
XXI СТОЛІТТЯ:  
МІЖДИСЦИПЛІНАРНІ ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ**

Матеріали  
Всеукраїнської науково-практичної конференції  
(м. Харків, 29 травня 2026 р.)

Харків  
«Право»  
2026

## Секція: Філософські науки

*Konnova N. O.,*

PhD in Philosophical Science, Associate  
Professor at  
the Department of International Relations  
and Political Philosophy,  
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University  
of Economics

### **POLITICAL VIOLENCE IN MODERN SOCIETY**

The concept of violence in the political space is one of the most important and complex in political theory. In different historical periods, its interpretation underwent significant changes, which was determined by the evolution of political systems, social relations, and philosophical concepts. If in antiquity violence could be considered as a necessary tool of power, then in modern discourse it is increasingly associated with human rights violations, crises of statehood and manifestations of systemic conflicts.

It is necessary to point out the relevance of the research, which is due to the need to revise traditional ideas about political violence in the context of modern transformations of power, information technologies and new forms of social control. In the 21st century, violence acquires not only physical, but also symbolic and digital forms, which requires a rethinking of its nature and role in the political space. Today, political violence is often manifested not only in open repressions or military conflicts, but also through mechanisms of informational influence, manipulation of public opinion and structural inequality, which changes traditional approaches to its understanding.

The methodological basis of studying this problem is based on an interdisciplinary approach that combines:

- hermeneutic analysis of texts and discursive practices (based on the ideas of F. Fanon, M. Foucault, A. Camus, H. Arendt, M. Weber, R. Braidotti, Ch. Mouffe and others);
- elements of critical theory and poststructuralism that allow us to identify key changes in the perception of violence.

Violence can be an effective political tool only if it is legitimized through ideological, moral or institutional frameworks. Its feasibility is determined not only by practical consequences, but also by how it is interpreted in political discourse.

In modern political regimes, there is a monopolization of the right to violence, which historically belongs to the state (according to Weber), but in modern conditions it creates an imbalance in the citizen's subjective right to self-defense. Despite the spread of violence as a phenomenon (political, informational, symbolic), the individual is actually deprived of the right to self-defence, which is increasingly classified as a crime. This creates a paradox: violence is increasing, and there are fewer legitimate subjects who have the right to it. The loss of the legitimate right to self-defense means the loss of subjectivity, the transformation of a citizen into an object of management and institutionalized violence.

This problem is directly related to the crisis of trust in the state, repressiveness political system and redefining the concept of security. In the modern political context, the right to violence is centralized and institutionalized, depriving individuals of the ability to defend themselves and thereby delegating all legitimacy for violent actions to the state – despite its practices not always being morally justified. This leads to a crisis of justice and growing distrust in institutions.

In the modern political space, violence remains an effective means of achieving political goals only under the conditions when it fits into legitimate narratives, is ideologically supported, and is perceived as necessary by certain social groups. Without such legitimation, it loses its expediency and leads to the delegitimization of power or the destruction of the political order. It is necessary to conduct an analysis of evolution of the concept of violence in the political space, the identification of key factors that influenced the change in its interpretations, as well as the definition of modern trends in its use. Next, it is necessary to consider the main theoretical approaches to the understanding of violence in political science, and then to analyse the historical dynamics of changes in this concept. After that, it is necessary to examine how technologies, ideologies and globalization processes influence contemporary forms of political violence. The problem of political violence can be considered as a metanarrative, as it not only requires an analysis of contemporary approaches to violence in politics, but also questions the foundations on which these approaches are based. It is important to demonstrate how political ideologies and historical narratives shape the modern understanding of violence, and in what contexts such violence is considered justified or condemned.

In contemporary society, violence appears to be displaced by law, yet in practice, political conflicts, wars, repression, and militarization persist.

This creates a problematic situation in which the concept of violence loses its definition, its role in the political order becomes more and more complicated, and there is a need for a new rethinking.

It is necessary to analyse a number of questions of a socio-philosophical nature: is violence an effective and appropriate tool of political action in the modern world, and under what conditions can its use be justified? Frantz Fanon is a decolonization theorist who became one of the most influential thinkers of the 20th century on the topics of violence, racism, colonialism, and liberation. Fanon wrote that the colonized subject regains his subjectivity through violence: «violence is purification: it frees the oppressed from the inferiority complex, from passivity and from the feeling of powerlessness» [1, p. 49]. In the postcolonial world, race becomes a sign of hierarchy, and violence disappears from direct visibility, but persists as a psychological control, standardization, discrimination, economic dependence. Modern political violence is not accidental or excessive, it is structural: spatial, symbolic, legal, linguistic. And it is precisely this violence, Fanon believes, that can be broken only by counter-violence from the colonized, which transforms them into subjects of history. Fanon shows that oppression can be not only material but also symbolic.

To highlight the conflicting views on political violence, one can present the position of Hannah Arendt, which is complex and contradictory, primarily due to her different understanding of the nature of violence, the struggle for liberation, and the subjectivity of the oppressed. Arendt perceived violence as something that destroys political space, believing that true politics is possible only through nonviolent action and dialogue as prerequisites for collective freedom. For Fanon, violence was a reaction to the systemic, structural violence of colonialism, which takes away subjectivity, humanity, and voice. Arendt failed to recognize that for many colonized subjects, politics is only possible through an act of resistance – and often violent. She believed that politics is a space of freedom where people can act as equals among equals [2]. Violence not only preserves order, but also destroys violent order, being both a manifestation of degradation and a potential for liberation. Disciplinary power does not kill, but forms, does not punish openly, but models behavior through control, supervision, normalization. In slavery, this manifests itself in the regulation of the body, work, sleep, nutrition – that is, in total control over life. In modern society, violence becomes routine and invisible, but

no less destructive. Combined, these two forms of power create a system where violence becomes a structural norm, legitimized as a necessity for maintaining order, production, and civilization. This is what Foucault calls the microphysics of power – it permeates all levels of life and body, not only punishing but also educating conquest. According to the concept of M. Foucault, biopolitics is focused on the management and regulation of «the ratio of births and deaths, the level of reproduction, the birth rate of the population, etc.» [3]; on marginality, a corrective war against individual bodies, as well as a genocidal war that «justifies the function of death in the economy of biopower by appealing to the principle that the death of others leads to the survival of the biologically stronger» [3]. Foucault shows that power does not always manifest itself in the form of overt violence – it exists in the discourses, practices, and institutions that shape the behavior of individuals and social groups. Violence can be justified in the context of justice when there is a system that clearly defines when and how violence can be used to fulfill certain social or political functions.

In the context of the post-structuralist critique of traditional political theory, the concept of conflict pluralism, developed by Ernesto Lacló and Chantal Mouffe, offers a radical reassessment of the nature of conflict and violence in the political space. Rejecting the liberal conception of politics as a sphere of consensus and rational discussion, they insist that antagonism is an integral part of social existence. Chantal Mouffe emphasizes that «consensus is often a form of oppression, when one point of view is presented as neutral or rational, eliminating other positions» [4]. This fixed definition of the norm is a form of semantic and linguistic violence, suppression of opposition. No political order is final, universal or even neutral, because it is always based on a certain choice, comparison and preference. The absence of a clear boundary between the public and the private, between the political and the sacred, gives rise to a silent form of violence – structural. This violence does not have one face, because it manifests itself as an inability to change, an imitation of the separation of the branches of power, corruption, clientelism, where free political speech or a different opinion is not just inappropriate – it is structurally impossible.

In the modern political context, the right to violence is centralized and institutionalized, which deprives the individual of the opportunity to exercise self-defense, thereby delegating all the legitimacy of violent actions to the state, despite its not always morally justified practice. This creates a crisis of justice and growing distrust of institutions.

If the oppressed has no right to violence, he loses the right to despair – and therefore, to a full-fledged political existence. In a world where systemic violence is institutionalized, the moral prohibition against violent resistance is not ethics – it is a strategy of control. That is why we should talk about violence not as an anomaly, but as a political opportunity.

## REFERENCES

1. Fanon F. Hnani i holodni / per. z fr. Kyiv: Vpered, LAT & K, 2016. 227 s. URL: [https://hromadalib.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/fanon\\_1961\\_damnes-1.pdf](https://hromadalib.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/fanon_1961_damnes-1.pdf) [In Ukrainian].
2. Arendt H. On Violence. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1970. 106 p.
3. Adams R. Michel Foucault: Biopolitics and Biopower. *CLT*. May 10, 2017. URL: <https://criticallegalthinking.com/2017/05/10/michel-foucault-biopolitics-biopower/>
4. Mouffe C. Democratic Politics and Conflict: An Agonistic Approach. *Política Común*. 2016. Vol. 9. URL: <https://doi.org/10.3998/pc.12322227.0009.011>.

*Кочетов Л. Г.,*  
аспірант кафедри філософії  
та політології,  
Житомирський державний університет  
імені Івана Франка

## МОРАЛЬНО-ПРАВОВІ КОЛІЗІЇ В ЦИФРОВОМУ СОЦІУМІ

Сучасний етап розвитку людства характеризується стрімким технологічним прогресом, фундаментальною трансформацією людського буття. Цифровізація є не просто зовнішнім інструментарієм, а новим «життєвим світом», що докорінно переформатовує традиційну аксіологічну вертикаль. У цьому контексті спостерігається криза традиційних цінностей, що проходять крізь горнило цифрових перетворень, які або втрачають свій первісний зміст, або вступають у гострий конфлікт із новими технологічними імперативами. Це створює загрозу дегуманізації та вимивання етичного начала з правових відносин. Право за своєю природою статичне, воно не встигає за динамікою «цифрового буття», що породжує стан правової

## ЗМІСТ

### Секція: Політичні науки

*Козловець М. А.*

Глобальна світосистема: турбулентність  
та перспективи розвитку..... 3

### Секція: Психологічні науки

*Бреян А. В.*

Феномен «ризикуну» як форма вияву свободи в екзистенційному  
досвіді суб'єкта ..... 10

*Грімзіна С. В., Маєвська Н. А.*

Саморегуляція особистості в умовах цифрового середовища..... 14

*Михайлюк І. В.*

Соціальні мережі як чинник становлення низької самооцінки  
старших підлітків ..... 19

*Олексюк Т. М.*

Внутрішня гармонія як психологічна умова  
самореалізації особистості..... 24

### Секція: Філософські науки

*Копнова Н. О.*

Political violence in modern society.. ..... 27

*Кочетов Л. Г.*

Морально-правові колізії в цифровому соціумі ..... 31

*Мошковський М. В.*

Інформаційно-комунікативний розвиток суспільства  
як цивілізаційна парадигма ХХІ століття.. ..... 34

*Палагута В. І.*

Цифрове голе життя сучасності..... 38

### Секція: Юридичні науки

*Копоненко М.*

Constituent instruments as the primary international legal basis for the  
settlement of disputes to which international organizations are parties..... 43

### Секція: Педагогічні науки

*Lazutkina Yu. A.*

AI-enhanced Learning Environments in Higher Education:  
Fostering 21st-century Competencies..... 48

Наукове видання

# **ГЛОБАЛЬНІ ВИКЛИКИ ХХІ СТОЛІТТЯ: МІЖДИСЦИПЛІНАРНІ ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ**

Матеріали

Всеукраїнської науково-практичної конференції  
(м. Харків, 29 травня 2026 р.)

Редактор *Т. О. Чернишова*

Підписано до друку 29.05.2026. Формат 60×84/16.  
Ум. друк. арк. 11. Обл.-вид. арк. 11. Тираж 100 пр. Зам. № 691

ТОВ «Видавничий дім «Право»,  
вул. Харківських Дивізій, 11/2, м. Харків, Україна  
Для кореспонденції: а/с 822, м. Харків, 61023, Україна  
Тел.: (050) 409-08-69, (067) 574-81-20  
Вебсайт: <https://pravo-izdat.com.ua>  
E-mail для замовників послуг: [verstka@pravo-izdat.com.ua](mailto:verstka@pravo-izdat.com.ua)  
E-mail для покупців: [sales@pravo-izdat.com.ua](mailto:sales@pravo-izdat.com.ua)  
Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи ДК № 8024 від 05.12.2023

Виготовлено ТОВ «Промарт Плюс»,  
вул. Весніна, 12, м. Харків, 61023, Україна  
тел. (097) 445-07-79  
Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи ДК № 8388 від 16.07.2025