

самого Достоевського майже нема. Основним моментом тлумачення творчості Достоевського були світоглядні (ідеологічні) позиції його дослідників, що призводило до дуже різноманітних і часто суперечливих відносно один одного висновків. Письменник ставав знаряддям ідейної боротьби опонентів, котрі асимілювали його з собою, що призводило до тлумачень, в яких Достоевський ставав ледь не проповідником їх ідей. Таку передумову осмислення Достоевського можна умовно назвати «Достоевський з себе» і цей тип переосмислення притаманний фактично всім представникам російської філософії раннього періоду аналізу Достоевського.

### Список використаних джерел:

1. Белинский В. Г. Полное собрание сочинений в 13 томах. Т. 4. / В. Г. Белинский; [Под общ. ред. Д. В. Иванова]. – М. – 1954. – 676 с.
2. Карсавин Л. П. Федор Павлович Карамазов как идеолог любви / Л. П. Карсавин // О Достоевском. – М. – Книга. – 1990. – С. 252-264.
3. Леонтьев К. Н. О всемирной любви, по поводу речи Ф. М. Достоевского на Пушкинском празднике / К. Н. Леонтьев // О Достоевском. – М. – Книга. – 1990. – С. 9-31.
4. Михайловский Н. К. Жестокий талант / Н. К. Михайловский // О Достоевском. – М. – Книга. – 1990. – С. 55-59.
5. Соколова Е. А. Проблема человека и поиск социальной гармонии в философских воззрениях Ф. М. Достоевского: автореф. диссер.: 09.00.11. / Е. А. Соколова. – Улан-Удэ. – 2004. – 22 с.
6. Соловьев В. С. Три речи в память Достоевского / В. С. Соловьев // О Достоевском. – М. – Книга. – 1990. – С. 32-58.
7. Тонких Н. В. История эволюции социально-политических взглядов Ф. М. Достоевского: Дис... канд. ист. наук : 07.00.02 / Н. В. Тонких. – Воронеж, 2005. – 253 с.

**Popravko O.O.**

*Student,*

*Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University*

## THE PHILOSOPHY OF WAR

Nowadays, it's extremely important to speak about war conflicts. War is still a central element of the human experience. And in this topic we can point out just war theory. It is a doctrine, also referred to as a tradition, of military ethics studied by theologians, ethicists, policy makers, and military leaders. The purpose of the doctrine is to ensure that war is morally justifiable through a series of criteria, all of which must be met for a war to be considered just. The criteria are split into two groups: „right to go to war” (jus ad bellum) and „right conduct in war” (jus in bello). The first concerns the morality of going to war, and the second connected with the moral conduct within war [6].

Some people argue that the Just War doctrine is inherently immoral, while others suggest that there is no place for ethics in war. Others still argue that the doctrine doesn't apply in the conditions of modern conflicts. The doctrine of the Just

War can deceive a person into thinking that because a war is just, it's actually a good thing. But you shouldn't think so about it. Just War theory postulates that war, while terrible, is not always the worst option. Important responsibilities, undesirable outcomes, or preventable atrocities may justify war.

The just war theory has a long history. The principles of a Just War originated with classical Greek and Roman philosophers like Plato and Cicero and were added to by Christian theologians like Augustine and Thomas Aquinas.

Cicero argued that there was no acceptable reason for war outside of just vengeance or self defence – in which he included the defence of honour. He also argued that a war could not be just unless it was publicly declared and unless compensation for the enemy's offence had first been demanded. Cicero based his argument on the assumption that nature and human reason biased a society against war, and that there was a fundamental code of behaviour for nations [3].

Saint Augustine himself did not approve of war. He believed that the only just reason to go to war was the desire for peace. Augustine accepted that there would always be wars. He thought that war was always a sin, and if there had to be a war, it should be waged with sadness. Besides, Augustine made it clear that individuals and states (or the rulers of states) have different obligations when it came to war or violence. He also stated that Christians did not have the right to defend themselves from violence, however they could use violence if it was necessary to defend the innocent against evil [2].

Nine hundred years later, Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) laid out the conditions under which a war could be justified:

- First, just war must be waged by a properly instituted authority such as the state.
- Second, war must occur for a good and just purpose rather than for self-gain or as an exercise of power.
- Third, peace must be a central motive even in the midst of violence [1].

One of the most famous leaders of a non-violent movement was Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948), who opposed British imperial rule in India during the 20th century. Gandhi took the religious principle of ahimsa (doing no harm) common to Buddhism, Hinduism and Jainism and turned it into a non-violent tool for mass action. He used it to fight not only colonial rule but social evils such as racial discrimination and untouchability as well. Gandhi called it „satyagraha” which means „truth force”. In this doctrine the aim of any non-violent conflict was to convert the opponent; to win over his mind and his heart and persuade him to your point of view.

Contemporary just war theory is dominated by two camps: traditionalist and revisionist. The traditionalists might as readily be called legalists. Their views on the morality of war are substantially led by international law, especially the law of armed conflict. Revisionists question the moral standing of states and the permissibility of national defence, argue for expanded permissions for humanitarian intervention, problematise civilian immunity, and contend that combatants fighting for wrongful aims cannot do anything right, besides lay down their weapons [7].

As to the philosophical foundations of just war theory: the traditionalist and revisionist positions are now well staked out. But the really interesting questions that remain to be answered should be approached without thinking in terms of that split.

Most notably, political philosophers may have something more to contribute to the just war theory debate. It would be interesting, too, to think with a more open mind about the institutions of international law (nobody has yet vindicated the claim that the law of armed conflict has authority, for example), and also about the role of the military within nation-states, outside of wartime [5].

All in all, in the twentieth century, just war theory has undergone a revival mainly in response to the invention of nuclear weaponry and American involvement in the Vietnam War. Academics have turned their attention to just war once again with international, national, academic, and military conferences developing and consolidating the theoretical aspects of the conventions. Just war theory has become a popular topic in International Relations, Political Science, Philosophy, Ethics, and Military History courses.

### References:

1. Aquinas, St Thomas. Politics and Ethics. A Norton critical edition, 1988.
2. Augustine, St. City of God. Penguin, 1984.
3. Dockrill, Michael and Barrie Paskins. The Ethics of War. Duckworth, 1979.
4. Orend, Brian. The Morality of War. Broadview, 2006.
5. Ryan, C., 2011, „Democratic Duty and the Moral Dilemmas of Soldiers”, Ethics, 122(1): 10–42.
6. Super User. «Catholic Education Resource Center». Catholic Education Resource Center.
7. Walzer, M., Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations, 4th edition, New York: Basic Books, 2006 [1977].

**Пронько А.М.**

*студентка,*

*Донецький національний технічний університет*

## РЕЛІГІЯ В ЕПОХУ ІНФОРМАЦІЙНИХ ТЕХНОЛОГІЙ

У наш час кібертехнології відкривають для приватизації релігійного життя нові можливості. Кібертехнології і Інтернет забезпечують бажаним високим рівнем комунікації і формують нові, мережеві спільноти. Анонімність Інтернету дозволяє конфесійно незаангажовано дізнаватися про активність конкретних громад і лідерів, вивчати інші релігії, відвідуючи релігійні служби в онлайн-просторі. США розширюють функціональність релігійних онлайн-сервісів, отримують поширення сайти сповіді і причастя, що викликає критику консервативно налаштованих громад. У християн з'являється безліч мережевих проєктів, в тому числі мережеві богослужіння.

Релігія знаходить своє втілення в кіберпросторі, віртуальний сегмент все більш помітно впливає на соціально-релігійну дійсність в реальності, через що багато гуманітарних та суспільних наук можуть набувати крім «офлайнового» ще й «онлайнний» вимір. Розвиток кіберпростору сприяє активізації релігійного життя: поява релігійного кіберпростору, Інтернет-церков,