

A SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS OF VIEWS ON SOCIALLY DANGEROUS BEHAVIOR IN WESTERN PHILOSOPHY

Mamatnazarov Lazizbek Turakuliyevich

Independent Researcher at the Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract. This article provides a fundamental analysis of the evolution of the concept of "socially dangerous behavior," ranging from classical criminology to the contemporary digital society. The study highlights the factors shaping social deviations and destructive actions through philosophical, sociological, and psychological approaches. Along with traditional offenses, it broadly covers cyber-destruction and info-psychological threats within the digital space. Furthermore, the paper scientifically substantiates the priority directions for increasing cognitive immunity and addressing anomie within gender factors, socialization processes in transmigrant families, synergetic paradigms, as well as phenomenological-existential and institutional-structural approaches.

Keywords: socially dangerous behavior, deviation, anomie, cybercrime, destruction, cognitive immunity, synergetics, labeling, prevention, solidarity.

Introduction. Deviations from order and norms established by society have been observed at all stages of human history. However, the concept of "socially dangerous behavior" and its scientific interpretation have undergone fundamental transformations over time. Today, this concept encompasses not only offenses but also a broad range of deviant states that threaten the sustainable development of society. In the contemporary system of scientific knowledge, the problem of socially dangerous behavior is interpreted as a universal phenomenon threatening social stability and security. The essence of this phenomenon manifests in the conscious or impulsive violation of established legal, moral, and social norms by an individual. In scientific analysis, socially dangerous behavior is evaluated not merely as an individual infraction, but as the result of a functional crisis within the system of social relations.

The formation of such behavior possesses a complex chain of determination, wherein the psychological traits of the individual intersect with the institutional state of the social environment. The primary defining feature of social danger is its "destructiveness," which aims to shatter existing mechanisms of order and trust in society. Research demonstrates that the increase in socially dangerous actions occurs during periods when society's "moral immunity" is weakened and social control mechanisms undergo deformation.

Research Methodology and Approaches (Methods). In the history of philosophical and sociological thought, the early classical roots of the concept of "socially dangerous behavior" manifested primarily in efforts to rationalize the boundaries between norms and crime legally and morally. Representatives of classical criminology and philosophy, such as Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham, interpreted destructive behavior as the product of an individual's rational choice and pragmatic interests; for them, social danger was understood as a breach of the "social contract" between society and the individual [16, p. 178]. At this stage, dangerous behavior was confined to purely physical or material harm, and the inevitability and proportionality of punishment were put forward as the primary mechanisms for its prevention. It is worth noting that within classicism, the deep socio-structural determinants of social danger remained overlooked, with attention focused solely on the legal form of the committed act.

To gain a deeper understanding of socially dangerous behavior, its contributing factors, and prevention mechanisms, it is essential to analyze phenomenological-existential, institutional-

structural (anomie), critical-symbolic (discursive), and socio-cultural-axiological (solidarity) methodological paradigms.

Analyzing the mechanisms behind socially dangerous behavior from the perspective of phenomenological and existential sociology is directly tied to the individual's self-awareness as a subject in the everyday lifeworld and their state of "ontological security." As Anthony Giddens emphasized, modernization and the destabilization of fundamental social institutions weaken the sense of internal ontological security in an individual, leading to increased existential anxiety. According to Alfred Schütz's phenomenological concept, when the system of meanings and "institutionalized intersubjective knowledge" in everyday life collapses, the individual loses the ability to structure events in their social environment, compensating for this state through dangerous or destructive actions. Under Ulrich Beck's concept of the "risk society," members of society are deprived of unified and clear institutional guarantees, forced to bear the risks of individual choices themselves. In such conditions of phenomenological instability, an individual's dangerous behavior and propensity toward deviation emerge more as the product of an internal existential crisis and the moral severance of social bonds rather than mere external influences.

Within the institutional-structural approach and the theory of anomie, this destructive process is explained fundamentally at the macrosociological level. According to Robert Merton's theory of structural anomie, the disparity between culturally prescribed goals recognized by society and the legitimate (legal) institutional means to achieve them creates strong structural strain on the individual. As a result of this strain, the individual is compelled to adopt dangerous and deviant behavioral forms such as innovation, retreatism, or rebellion. Travis Hirschi's social control and bonding theory demonstrates that the main factor preventing an individual from destructive actions is their institutional bond with family, the educational system, and society; when these bonds weaken, the social control mechanism fails, giving rise to dangerous behavior. When approached through Michel Foucault's views on disciplinary power and biopolitics, it becomes clear that institutional control and legal prevention mechanisms should guide behavior into institutionally self-regulating normative frameworks rather than relying solely on coercion. To eliminate these institutional imbalances, it is necessary to expand channels of social mobility in society and strengthen social control institutions. Critical sociology, symbolic power, and communicative action theories identify social dangers through the info-symbolic environment and communicative deformations within society. According to Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of "habitus" and "symbolic violence," the unequal distribution of social and cultural capital, alongside the marginalization of certain social groups' values, fosters internal resentment and latent aggression within the individual's habitus. Jürgen Habermas's theory of communicative action points out that the "colonization of the lifeworld" by system mechanisms (state and market institutions) distorts open and healthy communicative spaces in society. The deformation of communication and discourse creates fertile ground for misinformation, manipulation, and alien ideological influences, causing dangerous behavior to spread rapidly in an information society.

Within the socio-cultural and axiological approach, Pitirim Sorokin's theory of cultural crisis and altruistic solidarity holds significant methodological value. According to Sorokin, during periods when values undergo crisis and sensate culture prevails, moral and ethical orientations are lost, leading to a surge in mass dangerous and destructive behavior. In this context, the primary source capable of preserving society from disintegration is not superficial, formal passive compromise or simple tolerance, but deeply rooted social solidarity and organic moral-ethical resilience. Social solidarity and cohesion unite individuals around shared noble goals and collective responsibility.

Results and Analysis (Results). In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the establishment of positivist and sociological approaches in sociology and criminology marked a radical turning point in the conceptual content of the field. The theory of anomie introduced by Émile Durkheim grounded socially dangerous behavior not as a moral flaw of an individual, but as an objective manifestation of

53	ISSN 2277-3630 (online), Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue: 10 in October-2025 https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR
	Copyright (c) 2025 Author (s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

the erosion of normative systems, institutional vacuums, and social disorganization within society [19, p. 416]. During this era, the concept of dangerous behavior transcended the boundaries of legal codifications to become interpreted as a broad sociological phenomenon threatening internal social cohesion and solidarity, encompassing destructive subcultures and systemic deviations (suicide, chronic alcoholism, chronic anomie). Expanding upon the concept of anomie, Robert Merton located the origin of social danger in the disconnect between culturally defined goals and the legitimate, institutional means available to achieve them, establishing adaptive modes of dangerous behavior such as "innovation," "ritualism," "retreatism," and "rebellion" [9, p. 702].

In the second half of the 20th century, the evolution of socially dangerous behavior was enriched by microsociological and phenomenological approaches—specifically, Howard Becker and Edwin Lemert's labeling theory, alongside Edwin Sutherland's concept of differential association. During this period, researchers shifted focus from the objective nature of dangerous behavior toward its character as a social construct and the reaction of society. According to Becker's framework, no act is inherently dangerous in itself; rather, it acquires a dangerous quality when dominant social groups attach a "deviant" or "dangerous" social label to it [17, p. 179]. When primary deviation encounters a harsh and repressive reaction from society, secondary deviation takes root in the individual, leading them to internalize the destructive role and transform into a professional actor of socially dangerous behavior. Meanwhile, Sutherland proved that social danger—particularly "white-collar crime" and corrupt behavior—is continuously reproduced through daily interaction and learning within one's micro-environment [21, p. 643].

In the contemporary era of postmodernity and digital advancement, the transformation of "socially dangerous behavior" is being re-evaluated through Ulrich Beck's concept of the "risk society" and the methodology of digital deviantology. Today, social danger has moved beyond local or physical territorial boundaries to acquire a global and virtual character. As Manuel Castells's theory of the "network society" demonstrates, forms of behavior such as cybercrime, digital destruction, info-psychological and ideological manipulation, cyberbullying, and networked nihilism destabilize society far more rapidly and on a broader scale than traditional criminal or deviant behavior [18, p. 594]. In contemporary research, socially dangerous behavior is determined not only by an individual's physical actions but also by their activity in the cognitive-informational space and latent impacts aimed at eroding society's moral and institutional immunity.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, socially dangerous behavior was also analyzed from biological and anthropological perspectives. In his work *The Criminal Man*, Cesare Lombroso linked dangerous behavior to human biological structure and genetic predisposition [7, p. 124]. In his view, socially dangerous individuals were "born criminals," whose actions depended more on physiological factors than on the social environment.

However, Émile Durkheim, one of the founders of classical sociology, refuted this approach by putting forward the concept of "anomie." According to Durkheim, socially dangerous behavior is the result of a crisis in society's existing system of norms and values [3, p. 56]. He viewed deviation as an integral part of society and, to some extent, a necessary element for its development, as society redefines its boundaries and moral standards through deviations.

During the 1930s–1950s, Robert Merton expanded Durkheim's ideas by developing the theory of "social structure and anomie." According to Merton, socially dangerous behavior arises from the discrepancy between societal goals (e.g., material success) and the legitimate means to achieve them [9, p. 212]. During this period, behavioral models such as "innovation," "ritualism," "retreatism," and "rebellion" were scientifically grounded.

Additionally, representatives of the Chicago School (R. Park, E. Burgess) proposed the theory of "social disorganization." They argued that social dangers lie not in the character of the individual,

but in the low level of social control in the environment and neighborhood in which they live [17, p. 45].

In the second half of the 20th century, the "labeling" (stigmatization) theory developed by E. Lemert and H. Becker created a decisive shift in the evolution of the concept. According to it, it is not the behavior itself, but society's reaction to it that defines it as "dangerous" [5, p. 89]. If society labels an individual a "criminal," the individual begins to adapt to this role, leading to secondary deviation. Today, the concept of socially dangerous behavior has shifted from the traditional physical space into the virtual domain. Contemporary researchers (such as Manuel Castells) examine new forms of deviation in the network society—cyber-terrorism, digital anomie, and information manipulation.

In contemporary approaches, the concept of "resilience" (social adaptability/endurance) plays a crucial role. Research is now directed not only at the origins of danger, but also at building the moral and psychological immunity of individuals and society against these threats.

Discussion. Psychoanalytic and cognitive-neurosociological approaches serve as fundamental methodological foundations for understanding the internal psychodeterminants of socially dangerous behavior. According to deep psychology concepts established by Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung, and Erich Fromm, the emergence of socially dangerous actions in an individual is the result of internal aggressive impulses—Thanatos and auto-aggression—failing to manifest in socially acceptable forms (sublimation) and being suppressed (repression) by society [12, p. 142].

Within modern neurosociology and cognitive psychology, this process is investigated with greater precision: dangerous behavior is linked to cognitive distortions in human thinking, "catastrophizing," "emotional reasoning," and functional asymmetry in the brain's decision-making centers [2, p. 87]. In the era of digital and information warfare, through "cognitive warfare" and neuro-manipulations, an individual's cognitive filters are disrupted, and the brain's stress response mechanisms are activated. Consequently, the individual unwittingly becomes an executor of destructive and dangerous acts. Therefore, in New Uzbekistan, ensuring psychological stability and enhancing cognitive immunity in individuals serves as a fundamental psychological and neurosociological prevention mechanism in mitigating social risks [4, p. 54].

Gender and demographic factors dictate macro- and micro-level sociological determination in the manifestation of socially dangerous behavior. When examined within gender sociology, the types of dangerous behavior and deviation committed by men and women exhibit distinct specifics. In male behavior, external (outer) destruction dominates—physical aggression, criminality, and joining destructive groups—whereas female destruction often exhibits an internal (inner) character, manifesting in latent frustration, auto-aggression, and psychosomatic deviations [6, p. 115]. Nevertheless, the acceleration of globalization and labor migration processes has transformed traditional gender roles, increasing domestic imbalances and demographic risks. Children raised in transmigrant families or left behind during labor migration experience higher propensities toward dangerous behavior due to disruptions in socialization processes and emotional deprivation [8, p. 63]. To prevent these gender and demographic imbalances, elevating women's socio-economic activity, ensuring gender equality, and introducing socio-psychological support systems for migrant families are being implemented as comprehensive preventive tools in practice [1, p. 91].

The dynamics and future transformations of socially dangerous behavior find their ultimate conceptual framework within social synergetics and non-linear dynamics theory. According to the synergetic paradigm, a modernizing society is an open and unstable system wherein small destructive acts or informational fluctuations at bifurcation (crisis and sudden change) points can produce a "butterfly effect," leading to systemic disorder (chaos) and global social hazards [13, p. 215]. In contemporary digital society, network destruction and cyber-threats possess precisely this non-linear character. Therefore, strategies to prevent socially dangerous behavior must focus not merely on combating consequences, but on early detection of system fluctuations, harmonizing economic

inclusiveness, political-legal transparency, social cohesion, and cognitive spiritual-intellectual immunity in a synergetic manner to expand society's capacity for self-organization and dynamic stability (attractor) [14, p. 143].

Conclusion. The concept of "socially dangerous behavior" has evolved from simple physical crime to a complex, digitized, and systemic hazard threatening institutional structures. Investigating this phenomenon demands a fundamental interdisciplinary and rigorous methodological approach.

References

1. Abdullaeva M. Sh. *Sociological Factors of Gender Equality Policy and the Prevention of Family Destruction*. – Tashkent: University, 2022. – 91 p.
2. Beck A., Rush J. *Cognitive Therapy of Deviant Behavior and Personality Disorders*. – St. Petersburg: Piter, 2021. – P. 87.
3. Durkheim E. *Suicide: A Sociological Study* / Translated from French. – Moscow: Mysl, 1994. – P. 56.
4. Ziyodov S. T. *Cognitive Security of the Individual and Psycho-Sociological Protection Mechanisms in the Context of Information Warfare*. – Tashkent: Academy, 2023. – 54 p.
5. Castells M. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture* / Ed. by O. I. Shkaratan. – Moscow: Higher School of Economics, 2000. – P. 89.
6. Kletsina I. S. *Gender Sociology and Deviantology: Theory and Practice*. – St. Petersburg: Piter, 2020. – P. 115.
7. Lombroso C. *The Criminal Man*. – Moscow: Eksmo, 2005. – P. 124.
8. Makhkamov U. N. *Youth Socialization and Prevention of Destructive Behavior in Transmigratory Families*. – Samarkand: Samarkand State University Publishing House, 2024. – 63 p.
9. Merton R. K. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. – Moscow: AST, 2006. – P. 212.
10. Rahimova N. N. *The Philosophy of Information-Psychological Security and Media Literacy in the Digital Space*. – Bukhara: Durдона, 2023. – 240 p.
11. Sodiqov H. J. *Philosophical and Ethical Foundations of Ethno-Sociology and the Mahalla Institution in the Social Control System*. – Bukhara: Durдона, 2023. – 108 p.
12. Fromm E. *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. – Moscow: AST, 2017. – P. 142.
13. Haken H. *Synergetics: Hierarchies of Instabilities in Self-Organizing Systems*. – Moscow: Mir, 2003. – P. 215.
14. Yusupov E. Q. *Social Synergetics and Modeling of Social Risks in a Nonlinear Society*. – Namangan: Namangan State University, 2024. – 143 p.
15. Becker H. S. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. – New York: Free Press, 1963. – 179 p.
16. Beccaria C. *On Crimes and Punishments and Other Writings*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. – 178 p.
17. Becker G. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance* / Translated from English. – Moscow: Elementary Forms, 2018. – P. 45.
18. Castells M. *The Rise of the Network Society*. – Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2000. – 594 p.
19. Durkheim É. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. – London: Routledge, 2002. – 416 p.
20. Merton R. K. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. – New York: Free Press, 1968. – 702 p.
21. Sutherland E. H. *Principles of Criminology*. – Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1947. – 643 p.