

Open Access Article

SOCIO-ANTHROPOLOGICAL COMPATIBILITY OF PHILOSOPHICAL TECHNIQUES.

Rashidova Mashkhura Karimovna

Tashkent Institute of Architecture and Civil Engineering, Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophical and Socio-Political Sciences

Abstract: The article describes the used socio-anthropological technique in philosophy. And also their problems are considered

Key words: Socio-anthropological, philosophical techniques, modern society.

摘要：本文描述了哲学中使用的社会人类学技术。他们的问题也被考虑

关键词：社会人类学·哲学技术·现代社会。

Introduction

The problem of man has always been considered central in philosophy. Its development led to the emergence of special teachings about man, including socio-philosophical anthropology. Currently, the interest in it has increased. This is due to a number of the following practical and theoretical circumstances. In the modern changing world, interest in the processes, directions, tendencies of human development in the future has increased. The processes of substantive formation and constitution of socio-philosophical anthropology, which must respond to the challenges of the time, continue and are still incomplete. Having overcome the cosmo, theo, socio, scientiocentric orientations of the perception of the world, she raised anthropocentrism to the rank of her main paradigm, began to consider man as the only and highest subject of philosophy, to reduce the complex nature, the essence of man to one “basic structure”, a fundamental quality (for example, “eccentricity”, “activity”, “biological limitation”), to analyze a person regardless of

his dependence and relations with the world, society, culture, absolutized its capabilities and significance. In addition, modern socio-philosophical anthropology has not carried out a philosophical analysis, generalization and integration into a single holistic teaching of the latest information about society and a person, accumulated by specific, social and humanitarian sciences. In this regard, the need arose for its further definition, identification of its multifunctional capabilities. Modern society needs the formation and development of a new type of person - a humane person. In this regard, the problem of developing the humanizing and humanitarian functions of socio-philosophical anthropology arises, which can act as the optimal means for promoting the formation of this type of person.

The relevance of the research problem becomes more obvious as a result of understanding the development trend of Russian society and man. The loss by a person in our society of spiritual guidelines, the priority of striving for material well-being, insecurity of personal life, the growth of lack

Received: September 16, 2021 / Revised: October 11, 2021 / Accepted: October 29, 2021 / Published: November 22, 2021

About the authors: Rashidova Mashkhura Karimovna

Corresponding author- *Email:

of spirituality, etc. conditioned the special significance of the return to humanity, to the elevation of spiritual values, to the humanization of society, human consciousness. Theoretical and methodological analysis of the content and purpose of socio-philosophical anthropology will allow a deeper definition of the nature, essence of modern man, the main directions and ways of his further development, help him understand the true meaning of his life, place, role, purpose in the world.

Socio-philosophical anthropology as an independent doctrine arose in the middle of the twentieth century as a result of the transition of global philosophy from cosmo-, theo-, socio-, scientiocratic orientations to anthropocentrism, and then to anthropologism. This transition led first to the emergence of philosophical anthropology, and subsequently to its most important direction - socio-philosophical anthropology. Let's consider these processes in more detail.

The problem of man has been fundamental to philosophy since its inception. Any philosophical system contained a part devoted to anthropological problems. It contains the question "What is a man?" possessed equal status with the question "What is the world?". It is enough to analyze the philosophical teachings of Protagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Confucius, Buddha in order to understand the place of human problematics in ancient philosophy. Protagoras defined man as the measure of all things that are such only in human vision. He formulated the main methodological setting of the future philosophical anthropology in the following form: "The measure of all things is

man, existing, that they exist, and not existing, that they do not exist".

In the Renaissance, the problem of man again comes to the fore. Representatives of the Italian Renaissance F. Petrarca, K. Salutati, M. Ficino, L. Bruni, P. Mirandola believed that the main task of a person is the knowledge of things that relate to life and morals and which improve and decorate a person, the formation of such virtue as philanthropy, which manifests itself in a combination of education in the noble arts and such an important human trait as benevolence. They especially emphasized the idea that people tend to strive for unity, therefore, the more a person loves his peers, the more he expresses the essence of the human race and proves that he is a person. Representatives of tragic humanism believed that the main task of philosophy is to teach a person "the ability to listen to God" (B. Pascal).

A feature of the Renaissance is an attempt to change the main paradigm of philosophy: to move from a cosmocentric paradigm to an anthropocentric one, that is, to consider a person as an intrinsic value, as a free, individual being. However, it was not possible to implement this paradigm in practice: the influence of religion was too strong, too elite, the very phenomenon of "revival humanism" was ambiguous.

The philosophical problems of man began to be studied with renewed vigor in the 18-19th centuries. At this time, the idea was put forward that the main subject of any philosophy is primarily a person (for example, D. Hume, I. Kant, L. Feuerbach, N. G. Chernyshevsky, and others adhered to this point of view) ... The most important for the emergence of a special philosophical doctrine

about man - anthropology was the idea of I. Kant that the question "What is man?" - this is the main question of philosophy. In his famous work "Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View"

I. Kant made an attempt to systematically present the doctrine of man. He divided anthropology into physiological (natural essence of man) and pragmatic (spiritual essence of man). He attached particular importance to pragmatic anthropology, which studies a person as a freely acting creature (see [62], pp. 357-361, pp. 435-441). L. Feuerbach did much to substantiate the main question of man. He considered a person "the only, universal and supreme subject of philosophy", wrote that "the main, most essential sensible object of a person is the person himself, only in the person's gaze on a person the light of consciousness and mind lights up" ([154], v.1, p.202, p.190).

Important ideas for socio-philosophical anthropology are also contained in the philosophy of G. Hegel, K. Marx. So, G. Hegel wrote a lot about the reference model of a person (a beautiful personality), believed that a person is able to cognize the laws of the absolute spirit, which is the basis of the universe. He was more restrained than I. Kant spoke about anthropology (human knowledge), but he recognized its necessity and significance. So, Hegel wrote: "For life, such knowledge (we are talking about human knowledge

- AS) is undoubtedly useful and necessary"([31], p.6-8). Karl Marx developed the idea of the social essence of man. Fundamentally important for socio-philosophical anthropology is the idea that "the essence of a person is not an abstract

inherent in a separate individual. In its reality, it is the totality of all social relations"([89], v.3, p.3). At the same time, in the philosophical systems of G. Hegel, L. Feuerbach and K. Marx, the problem of man was solved one-sidedly. For example, G. Hegel proceeded from the principle of the world mind, while for him man was only that reality in which the world mind finds its self-consciousness. L. Feuerbach viewed man primarily as a psychophysiological being, to a lesser extent analyzed his social nature. K. Marx considered man, first of all, as a social being, to a lesser extent revealed his unique, individual nature.

In the late 19th - early 20th centuries. the most important ideas about man were formulated by F. Nietzsche, A. Schopenhauer, O. Spengler and others, which were later borrowed by philosophical anthropology. Thus, F. Nietzsche developed the idea of the constant formation of man as a living being, which is characterized by contradiction and complexity ([104], pp.23-25). O. Spengler emphasized that a person will begin to think like a person when he realizes his terrifying loneliness in the Universe ([188], pp. 172-173).

An important role for the emergence and development of socio-philosophical anthropology was played by sociology as a special science of social processes and social actions of a person. In it, the problems of the relationship between society and man began to be investigated on the basis of specific empirical material. Socio-philosophical anthropology used the ideas, first of all, of the following sociological theories: M. Weber's theory of social action, C. Cooley's theory of the mirror "I", D. Moreno's role theory of

personality, E. Fromm's psychoanalytic theory, and the theory of human social mobility. Sorokin, etc. The ideas were used that a person is a product of his social connections, that his life environment determines the role functions of a person, his vital needs and contradictions, which are the source of social actions of a person.

Socio-philosophical anthropology also used many of the humanistic ideas contained in Russian philosophy. This was primarily due to its socio-anthropological nature. All Russian philosophers tried to find answers to the questions: "What is a person?", "How can a person live?", "How to find the meaning of life?", "How to improve oneself?" (see, for example, the philosophical teachings of N.A. Berdyaev, S.N. Bulgakov, F.M. Dostoevsky, P.L. Lavrov, P.I. Novgorodtsev, V.I. Lenin, V.S. Soloviev, L. Tolstoy, G.P. Fedotov, N.G. Chernyshevsky, S.L. Frank and others). In Russian philosophy, many human problems were solved differently than in Western philosophy. Russian philosophers viewed man primarily as not a natural being, but as a spiritual person seeking "the truth and meaning of his life". A special place in the anthropological philosophy of Russia was occupied by the questions of the completeness, inseparability of the human personality, its fusion with the people, the search for moral guidelines in human life. The most anthropological was the philosophy of N.G. Chernyshevsky (see his work "The Anthropological Principle of Philosophy"), N.A. Berdyaev (see his work "The Purpose of Man"), etc. So, for example, N.G. Chernyshevsky wrote that "the basis for everything that we say about any special branch of life should be general concepts

about the nature of a person, the motives for activity and its needs in it" ([181], v. 9, p. 829). N.A. Berdyaev, in turn, wrote: "In the anthropology of idealism, naturalistic evolutionism, sociology and psychopathology, individual essential features are captured - a person is a being that carries reason and values, there is a developing being, there is a social being and a being sick from a conflict of consciousness and unconsciousness. But none of these directions captures the essence of human nature, its integrity. Only biblical-Christian anthropology is a teaching about an integral human being, about his origin and his purpose" ([13], pp. 50-51).

So, by the beginning of the 20th century, world philosophy had accumulated sufficient material about man, which led to the emergence of a special philosophical teaching about man - philosophical anthropology. Philosophical

anthropology was created and developed, first of all, by the German philosophers M. Scheler, G. Plesner, A. Gehlen. So, M. Scheler in his work "The Position of Man in Space" (1928) put forward the task of creating, on the basis of the synthesis of philosophical and natural science knowledge about man, the fundamental science about him - philosophical anthropology, in addition, he created a program of comprehensive knowledge person. He believed that man, being a spiritual being, is free and open to the world. However, due to the fact that divine spirituality reigns in the world, the formation of a person is understood by him as the realization in a person of the divine spirit and vital "impulse" (see [185], pp. 31-95). G. Plesner in his work "The Steps of the Organic

and Man" (1928) formulated a number of laws of philosophical anthropology, for example: the laws of mediated immediacy, natural artificiality, etc. He interpreted a person as an eccentric being who strives for endless self-change, objectifies his spirituality in the achievements of culture (see [116], pp. 96-151). A. Gehlen in his works "Man. Its nature and its position in the world" (1944), "On the taxonomy of anthropology" (1963) formulated the idea of the possibility of the existence of a special philosophical science about man - philosophical anthropology and developed some of its sections. He considered a person to be an active being, working for his future, forming a socio-cultural environment to replenish his biological inadequacy (see [31], pp. 152-201). All of them tried to realize their plans for creating a philosophical anthropology, substantiated the need to reduce it to the search for a fundamental principle in man (for M. Scheler it is spirit, for G. Plesner it is self-improvement, for A. Gehlen it is an active action) ... Its undoubted achievements should be recognized: anthropocentric construction of philosophy; consideration of the problem of man as the main fundamental problem of philosophy; philosophical analysis of the surrounding world in the human dimension; the combination of a philosophical analysis of human problems with specific scientific data about a person; identification of the "basic structure", the fundamental quality of a person; analysis of the biological nature of a person in the context of his social living environment, which causes a change in the nature of a person as a whole.

However, the global tasks put forward by philosophical anthropology

she, completely failed to solve. This was due, first of all, to its anthropocentric orientation, that is, having criticized cosmo-, theo- and other centrism, she herself took another opposite position - anthropocentrism. Now man was declared the only subject of global philosophy. It is this aspect that has caused criticism of philosophical anthropology by many Western (M. Buber, N. Hartmann, M. Heidegger, etc.) and Soviet (P. Korneev, K. Lyubutin, etc.) philosophers. For example, M. Heidegger did not consider his teaching to be anthropological and wrote that "no epoch knew so much and so much variety about man as ours, and at the same time, no epoch knew less than ours what man is." (Quoted from [18], p.212). N. Hartmann also opposed anthropology as a separate philosophical doctrine of man. He considered it only as a part of the ontology (see [138], pp. 69-71).

Philosophical anthropology, on the one hand, was pushed into the background by existentialism, Marxism, Freudianism, whose ideas about man were more popular in the 20th century, on the other hand, it was differentiated into different types: biological (A. Gehlen, A. Portman), religious (E. Hengstenberg, F. Hammer), cultural (M. Landman, E. Rothacker), pedagogical (O. Bolnov), sociological (H. Shelsky, H. Fryer), etc. For example, the biological direction in anthropology (M. Scheler, A. Portman, H. Plesner, A. Gehlen, etc.) began to consider a person mainly from a biological point of view. Man was understood as a "sick animal," "a false step in life," "an incomplete being," and so on. Religious anthropology (M. Buber, I. Lotz, F. Hammer and others) began to consider a person through religious-Christian

attitudes of understanding the world, God, the connection between spirit and man. The highest manifestation of the essence of man was declared to be love for God. Social, cultural anthropology (F. Boas, K. Levi-Strauss, B. Malinovsky, L. White and others) began to consider a person in relation to their cultural conditions of existence. Among all the indicated directions, the most dynamically developing direction was socio-philosophical anthropology. Its development was influenced by the following circumstances. First, the need for further understanding of the humanistic ideas formulated by global philosophy in the middle of the 20th century (about the need for a person to return to himself, to humanity (J.P. Sartre, M. Heidegger), about the need for a humanistic revolution in man himself (S. Mendelovich, A. Peccei), about solving the problems of the meaning of human life (A. Camu, E. Fromm), about overcoming the massization of consciousness, one-dimensionality of a person (A. Weber, G. Marcuse, H. Ortega-i - Gassettes), etc.). Secondly, the need for philosophical generalization of the accumulated, significant information about a person by specific schools of philosophical anthropology (in biological anthropology - about the active development of the biological nature of man, in cultural anthropology - about culture as a mechanism for maintaining and developing society and man, psychological anthropology - about self-affirmation as a mechanism of human development, in sociological anthropology - about the creation of a society by a person as a kind of compensation for his biological limitations). Many representatives of classical philosophical anthropology began to deal

mainly with socio-philosophical and anthropological problems.

Anthropological. Socio-philosophical anthropology is built on the basis of considering a person as the main subject of study. It requires the study of all types of human relationships with the world around him through the human dimension, the vision of the world. Currently, she is trying on a new basis to implement the principle of Protagoras "Man is the measure of all things." Anthropology is the central principle of socio-philosophical anthropology. Thus, one of its classics M. Scheler wrote: "When a person (and this is just part of his essence, is the act of the very formation of a person) once stood out from all of nature, made it his" subject, "then he seems to look around in awe and asks: "Where am I myself? What is my place?" He, in fact, can no longer say: "I am a part of the world, locked in it", because the actual being of his spirit and personality surpasses even the forms of being of this "world" in space and time. And so he looks at nothing. This look opens up to him, as it were, the possibility of "absolute nothing", which attracts him to a further question: "Why is there a world at all, why and how there is

"I am"?" ([185], p.90). At the same time, it is necessary to understand the danger of the transition of the principle of anthropology to the principle of anthropocentricity. In modern socio-philosophical anthropology, a person is considered not as the only, central point of philosophizing, but as a part of the world, society, which is in a relationship of interdependence and interdependence with the whole world, society as a whole and their separate realities.

The first reality with which a person is connected is nature, that is, the objective world surrounding a person. The closest natural environment has the greatest impact on humans. A person, like any living being, cannot exist without interaction with the external (natural environment). Nature is a necessary foundation, a condition for the favorable functioning of man. In this respect, man acts as a part of nature.

The importance of the natural environment for humans was different in different periods of human development. At the early stages of the development of human civilization, there was a huge dependence of man on the natural environment (first of all, the means of life). Subsequently, this dependence weakened, but dependence on natural means of labor grew. The theoretical concept of the relationship between man and nature was also changing. The natural system has a certain mechanism of self-regulation, self-distribution and self-healing. In this regard, the influence of man on nature (without this circumstance, the very life of man is impossible) should not disrupt the operation of this mechanism. Excessive technical impact on nature (for example, today technomass prevails over biomass, 1 - increases annually by 1014, and 2 -1012 has led to the fact that at present humanity is faced with an environmental problem, the failure of which threatens its very existence. Numerous changes in the nature of the environment as a result of ineffective human activity (inability of natural systems to self-regulation, self-healing and self-adaptation, pollution of nature, "greenhouse effect", depletion of non-renewable natural resources, etc.) reversely affect the nature of man himself. Gene

mutations, reduced life expectancy, diseases (cancer, AIDS), an increase in the number of inferior newborns, etc. are only a small part of the phenomena caused by changes in the human environment.

Consideration of the laws of the functioning of natural systems is not

is the main task of socio-philosophical anthropology. She considers nature in the aspect that nature is the most important factor, firstly, the functioning of society and man, and secondly, the determination of a number of biological needs and abilities of man.

The most important factor in the formation and development of a person is society, as a special, specific part of the material world, representing the ways and forms of interaction and unification of people. Society, as a social form of movement of matter, is isolated from the material world, acquires its own characteristics, and at the same time remains in unity with the rest of material nature. Society, like nature, is an objective reality, that is, exists outside and independently of a person, has its own patterns and tendencies of development. Various connections and interactions arise between people, as well as different subsystems of society, they are called social relations. They, as a rule, differ in the spheres of society: material and spiritual (the first provides society with material opportunities for existence and development through the production of consumer products, for example: food, drink, clothing, housing, etc. ; the second; - spiritual and cultural opportunities due to the production of spiritual consumer products, for example: knowledge, values, ideals, principles, beliefs, etc.). Any society is created and functions

with the aim of protecting against external aggression and maintaining order inside the country, optimizing and rationalizing the joint life of people, organizing the economic and economic existence of people, governing the country, cultural and educational development of a person as a member of society, dissemination of moral, cultural patterns, values, norms of behavior, self-support, self-adaptation and self-development of society, etc.

Society is the result of the collective essence of man, the result of the integration of numerous contacts of people with each other, the objectified world of human relations, the objectification of the spiritual and creative goals of people, therefore, firstly, a man as a generic being represents society in himself, which itself creates and is both its object and the subject of the transformation of social relations, secondly, a person as a specific individual living in a certain historical time finds a society of a specific type and in this aspect acts as a product of this society, society programs its life activity, setting the norms, patterns, values of life, a person is still an independent, creative, actively acting subject. Society influences a person through a number of social institutions that ensure its functioning, control it in various spheres of society, regulate its relationship with other people in large groups of people. It is a complex formation and consists of many subsystems, elements, connections and interactions, and the greatest impact on a person is exerted by the spheres of social life: economic (relations in the process of material production); social (interactions of classes, social strata and groups); political (interaction of power institutions); spiritual (interaction of

various forms of social consciousness); consumer (sphere of satisfying their needs); recreational (areas of recreation and recovery of vitality); types of social institutions of society (institutions that perform managerial and economic functions in society): material production (the sphere of people's life, in which material consumer products are produced): property (people's attitudes regarding their possession of certain materials); real and spiritual values); banks (financing and lending system); the state (an organization that governs society with the help of power); science (an organization that creates new knowledge and disseminates it); school (an organization that performs the functions of teaching, education and training); collective (organization of people, associations with joint activities, property and goals); family (an organization of people united by kinship ties and the unity of household, cultural and influential activities); mass media (an organization engaged in the dissemination of information using technical means to large groups of people); infrastructure (auxiliary sector of industries: transport, communications, energy, consumer services, etc.); types of social communities of people (an integral set of people, which is an independent subject of social action): social-class communities (class, stratum, social strata), social and national communities (nationality, nation, ethnos), socio-demographic communities (gender age groups), socio-territorial communities (urban, rural population), social and professional communities (professional groups), specific group (small) communities (primary team, friends, family, neighbors). Each person finds the system of social relations as a product of

the activities of previous generations. The task of a person is to join this system, to master the socio-cultural experience. In this respect, a person is a product (object) of those social relations that have already taken shape at a given time. The formation of a person is carried out as a result of socialization of individuals (assimilation of socio-cultural experience), directed education (appropriate impact on a person), mastering social roles and norms, mastering the types of life. The social sphere forms in a person a set of needs, abilities and qualities that are typical for large groups of people. In this aspect, a person is characterized by the unity of the general, typical (universal, generic) and special (formational, civilizational, class, national). In addition, a person's own biogenetic program, an active perception by a person of the requirements of society, a difference in the microenvironment, etc. cause a person to have individual, specific traits. Therefore, a person is a creature characterized by both common, special, and single features.

Conclusion

Of particular importance among all these principles is the principle of anthropology. It lies in the fact that a person is considered as the main subject of philosophical reflection, the picture of the surrounding reality is given in the human dimension. This principle allows us to overcome the lack of philosophical anthropology as a whole, which was of an anthropocentric nature (man is the highest and only subject of philosophy). The main paradigm and principles of socio-

philosophical anthropology indicate its humanistic content and purpose in society in general and in human life in particular. In general terms, the humanism and humanitarianism of socio-philosophical anthropology lies in the fact that it conditions the return of society, each person to a person, to oneself, considers a person as the highest value in itself and an end in itself for social development, determines the naturalness of rights and freedoms a person, explains to him the true meaning of life in the surrounding reality.

References:

1. Yuldoshev, S. and others. (2002). New and most recent period Western European philosophy (XVII-XX centuries). Tashkent: Shark.
2. Ruzmatova, G. (2016). History of Philosophy: Current Problems of Modern Western Philosophy. Tashkent: New edition.
3. Agazzi E. Man as a subject of philosophical analysis. - In the book: On the human in man. Ed. I.T.Frolov. - M., 1991.
4. Vernadsky V.I. Reflections of a naturalist. In 2 hours - M., 1977.
5. Vodyansky A.M. Historical and social science education-
6. nie: development strategy. - Teaching history at school, 1995, no. 3.
7. Volkov A.I. The human dimension of progress. M., 1990.
8. Volkov Yu.G., Polikarpov V.S. Integral human nature. Rostov-on-Don, 1994.