



Some Problems in Understanding and Explaining the Science of Philosophy

Suhrob Panjiev

Termez State University Teacher of the Department of Philosophy

Abstract: *In the state rassmatrivayutsya some problems of understanding and interpretation of philosophical science, in frequency, differences between philosophies and philosophical studies, philosophical content of ethical concepts and concrete dialectical relations.*

Keywords: *philosophy, philosopher, philosopher, science, truth, knowledge, doubt, verification, falsification, action, literature, literary criticism*

Date of Submission: 15-10-2021

Date of Acceptance: 30-11-2021

It is known that the "philosophy" taught in higher education institutions as a subject relies on two sources - primary and secondary sources. The primary sources are the works of philosophers themselves who make philosophical observations about being, society, and nature. In other words, in such a play, it doesn't matter who says what. Secondary sources are the works of philosophers, their views and works, who are directly concerned with philosophical issues. In other words, the second source is a work about the first source.

Philosophy as a science covers both sources equally. Although considered as one, there are essentially two areas here. The primary sources are indeed philosophy, but the secondary sources are philosophical, not philosophical. It would be more accurate to call the authors of the primary sources "philosophers" and the authors of the secondary sources "philosophers." For example, Aristotle is a philosopher, but the person who writes about Aristotle, his teachings, is not a philosopher, but a philosopher.

For the philosopher, what others say is of secondary importance. His main job is to focus directly on the philosophical issue. For example, what can man know, is there a limit to reason, what is the criterion of truth, is equality justice, if justice is justice, is any equality justice, what is the basis of power, what is its legitimacy, and is it possible to justify it morally? they are interested. Philosophical debates revolve around the same topics. In other words, "said-said" is secondary. Importantly, can you justify what you think? Logic and experience are crucial in Chinese philosophy.

In philosophy, however, the questions are directed to a slightly different context. For example, what is the difference between Aristotle and Hobbes' views on the legitimacy of state power? How Kant justified the existence of synthetic-a priori judgments, what David Hume's critique of the inductive method is based on, and so on. These are not philosophical questions, but questions about philosophers. It is not a philosophical issue for the philosopher, but the subject of the philosophers themselves.

This classification is conditional, and there are those who fall into both categories. Bertrand Russell, for example, belongs to both at the same time. He wrote works on both the history of philosophy and philosophical issues, which greatly influenced the formation of analytical philosophy.

It doesn't matter what degree the philosophers have or don't have at all. A philosopher is a person who is interested in philosophical issues and is inclined to think philosophically. He doesn't even have to write his thoughts into a book. Most of the philosophers of the past were experts in various fields. For example, Karl Popper and Bertrand Russell came from mathematics, Ludwig Wittgenstein from engineering, Ernst Max, Rudolf Carnap, Thomas Kuhn from physics. Abu Hamid al-Ghazali, whom philosophers call philosophers today, did not call himself a philosopher. In general, most of the great philosophers who have emerged since the second half of the 19th century are representatives of other fields and have made a worthy contribution to the development of philosophical science. A true scholar of any field will gradually become less and less aware of his interest in the philosophical issues of his field. If you are a physicist, you will sooner or later start thinking about matter, the laws of nature, existence in general. Naturally, you deepen. Some of your ideas are not verified or falsified by existing physical methods. That is, it does not have academic status. But it's interesting to you that you think it needs to be explored in the future. That is, you also think about issues that are unresolved in the current situation. And you won't notice that you're slowly moving in the direction of philosophy. Some not only think, but also write down their thoughts. To give a concrete example, Stephen Hawking is likely to be remembered as a philosopher-physicist in the future, and his ideas will be included in philosophy textbooks. In the last twenty years of his life, Ernst Mayr, who played an important role in biology in the twentieth century, wrote a separate book on the philosophy of biology, noting that the philosophy of science does not take into account specific aspects of biology, say, different from physics. (Ernst Mayr. *This is Biology: The Science of Living World*). I have no doubt that his ideas will have a great influence on the understanding of the biological sciences in the philosophy of science, and that he too will be remembered as a philosopher in the future. Bertrand Russell's penetration into philosophy was also due to his interest in logic, the foundation of mathematics, and the problems associated with its substantiation. Henri Poincaré, who is considered to be a representative of conventionalism and intuitionism in the philosophy of science, but was originally a mathematician, and one of the greatest mathematicians in history, has written so many works that he can easily be considered a philosopher.

If you are a political scientist, you study political institutions, individuals, their relationships, based on your field, you try to discover the regularity and legitimacy in them. At the same time, as your experience and knowledge increase, you will begin to deepen. Now you are not just about a particular political unit, an institution, you are about to find the basis, the essence of power for all eras. Here you will not feel that you have crossed the line of political science and moved on to the philosophy of politics. This is how you become a political philosopher. Whichever of your ideas as a political scientist or philosopher goes down in history, you will be remembered as either a political scientist or a philosopher.

It is clear that philosophy is not the inherent property of any industry. Throwing an unanswered question in itself is a big step if it is expressed correctly. Avoiding transitory traditions and asking big, big questions makes a person a philosopher. Even if he doesn't want to.

Philosophers, on the other hand, in contrast to philosophers, are usually specialists with a degree in philosophy. They are more interested in the philosophers themselves than in philosophical matters. If you ask a philosopher about philosophy, or tell him to explain philosophy to me, it is natural that he will tell you his subject, that is, the thoughts of past philosophers. And you think that's the philosophy.

But it should be noted that if a philosopher has the ability to think philosophically, he can be a philosopher who has become a philosopher just like a physicist or a biologist who has become a philosopher. For example, in the history of human thought, I think no field is as specialized as philosophical. Where thought arises, how it develops, how the struggle of ideas takes place, these can be studied much more deeply in the context of the history of philosophical thought. And that in itself is a philosophy. In general, the philosopher has a great opportunity to advance serious philosophical ideas.

I have said that there are two sources of philosophy as a subject. Unfortunately, the teaching of philosophy focuses more on the two sources than the other. In any case, we have it. Students learn philosophy mainly from the textbook. Primary sources are almost ignored. As a result, students' simple ideas about philosophy are formed as a result of reading books by other philosophers. Those who have not read the primary sources cannot be philosophers, let alone philosophers. Dividing ideas into evil and good, he keeps repeating it.

Let us look at this absurd situation in the example of literature and literary criticism to get a clearer picture of the situation. Literature is different, literature is different. There is no need to argue about that. The product of the writers, the poets, will be literature (just as the works of philosophers constitute philosophy), the works of literary critics will be literary (just as the works of philosophers are philosophical). Is it possible to become a literary critic without reading any work of art, but simply with the works of other literary critics? For example, is it possible to become an almighty without reading "Last Days" and be limited to a monograph written about him?

The philosopher also needs secondary sources. It is not always easy to read and understand primary sources. For example, many find it difficult to read and understand Hegel or Heidegger. Wittgenstein's is written as if understandable, but even then many are confused. Kant's major works are written in such a dry academic language that anyone who is not seriously interested in his ideas will not be impatient to read them. Sometimes comments are asked. Even when you understand that primary source on your own, some aspect may be overlooked, and its interpretation may draw your attention to it. In general, secondary sources are just an exchange of views on primary sources. Sharing ideas, of course, is beneficial. But the comments are not always accurate. The personal interests and inclinations of the commentator may be mixed with it. Therefore, the primary source is the most important for the philosopher, unfortunately, there is a serious gap in education in this regard. There are very few true philosophical books in Uzbek, and students look for, find, and do not read Uzbek. Eventually, with a single textbook, he forms simple and eloquent ideas about philosophy, becoming a philosopher. That is why he distances philosophy from true philosophy, from zealous philosophical observations. Students see it as an "exhortation to teach what Aristotle, Plato, Farabi, and Beruni meant." However, philosophy is far from both exhortation and gossip.

In conclusion, we can say that philosophy is a rebellious field by nature, it is skeptical of everything, avoids trends, criticizes, does not bury questions, touches the hearts of fanatics, seeks logic in traditions, and if it does not find it, denies such a tradition. For the philosopher, such concepts as "Uzbekism" and "nationalism" are alien, for him there are morally right and wrong, epistemically true and false, ontologically existing and non-existent, politically legitimate and illegitimate.

So the philosophy is not to act on what someone says, but to have a say.