



Modern Development Trends of Socio-Philosophical Theory

Valiev Botir Nasirovich

*International Islamic Academy of Uzbekistan Department of social and humanitarian sciences
Associate professor, candidate of philosophy*

Annotation: *The article is devoted to the issues of revealing modern development trends of socio-philosophical theory. It describes the tasks of modern philosophical thinking, new methodological aspects of researching social events and phenomena, and the foundations of the existence of social reality. The article also explores the relationship between religion and science, the relationship between religion and the secular state in the dialectical relationship between religion and society.*

Keywords: *socio-philosophical theory, social event, social reality, philosophical understanding, knowledge, religion, science.*

Date of Submission: 11-11-2022

Date of Acceptance: 17-12-2022

In today's increasingly globalized, at the same time multipolar, multiconfessional and diverse world, there is a need to re-understand social reality in front of social philosophical theory. This need is determined by the specifics of the reality, development requirements and criteria of the current era. The tasks of modern philosophical thinking in this direction cannot be limited to the use of metaphysical social models and teachings that explain the essence of sociality in a rather abstract way. One of the urgent tasks of philosophical theory is not to continue or supplement the doctrines of the "peak" (such as the change of formations, metahistory) or "end" (such as the end of history, the third wave, the clash of civilizations) of the socio-historical process, but to re-create social reality through understanding its new aspects of ontological and methodological existence¹. It is from this aspect that a new methodological task of researching social events and phenomena as a problem arises. Also, from an ontological point of view, philosophy returns to the generalization of the experience of social life, abstract ontological issues become concrete, directly connected with life, practical problems. Social reality, on the other hand, continues to be renewed with constructive openness and enthusiasm, which is never finished by recurring forms and cannot be limited.

Views about the foundations of the existence of social reality have always been emphasized in social teachings. However, it is important to note that these emphases are not mutually exclusive to one degree or another. It is important to ensure that today's approach does not repeat the interpretations of its predecessors. At the same time, it is necessary to take into account that not believing in justifications of the finality of history does not mean to cancel the principle of "substantiality" at all. The existence of unfounded social phenomena does not mean that they do not have a basis, but it indicates that they are not understood, existing changes, conditions for the

¹ Поппер К. Нищета историцизма. М.: Прогресс, 1993.; Тоффлер Э. Третья волна. М.: АСТ, 2002.; Уайт Х. Метаистория. Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 2002.; Фукуяма Ф. Конец истории и последний человек. М.: Аст, 2015.; Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций. М.: АСТ, 2003.; Шпенглер О. Закат Европы: очерки морфологии мировой истории. М.: Мысль, 1993.; Ясперс К. Смысл и назначение истории. М.: Республика, 1994.

possibility of manifestation, causal connections have not been determined. Based on this approach, it can be said that even in conditions where the justification of events is not complete or absolute, their existence will still have some basis. The very existence of sociality makes it the basis of community life.

While this basis conditions the possibilities of the existence of reality, due to the fact that the duration of events is limited, it continues to change and begins to leave them. On the other hand, the disappearance of a basis does not deny the existence of another basis. The openness of leaving the framework of the social system is characteristic of practical life, and the closedness and totalitarianization of social reality continues to change as its inevitable state. The task of re-understanding social life is defined not only by the need to go beyond metaphysical views on its conceptualization, but also by the need to describe the perspective and holistic philosophical understanding of our current social reality. At this point, it will be possible to distinguish features that indicate the need to develop a socio-philosophical theory. We believe that they give certain goals and directions to the perspective of the development of modern socio-philosophical knowledge.

The first is that the current personal world has become a new, unique social reality. There are many concepts in philosophical and socio-humanistic sciences that express the changing and updating of social reality: "globalization", "glocalization" (acquiring a global identity), "mondialization" (acquiring a common voice), "virtualization", "hybridization", "networked or information society", "post-industrial society"² are among them. Each of these concepts is distinguished by its emphasis on a unique process. At the same time, it can be recognized that there is a commonality in their content. The new social reality has caused the simultaneous expansion and contraction of social relations in terms of space and time. On the one hand, it is expanding. The phenomenon of the human world, their existence together, in the same space and time, is going beyond the borders of the planet earth. On the other hand - narrowing. Because the world is becoming familiar and close. Global community, cooperation and communication make our participation in global processes, our interexistence, diversity and mixed situations seem normal. Generalization in space leads to the formation of a single human world, different from the external world. The world, as always, is made up of various relationships. The New World has also become a space for existing in relationships, as a single world. Our new social reality requires a new approach to existence. In it, the idea of difference and plurality, uniqueness in meaning, and horizontality in relations have an important place.

The second is that our views of existence are conditioned by the fact that our social reality is out of the framework of the theological structure. The renewal of ontological views in the 20th century is associated with M. Heidegger's doctrine of the destruction of social existence³. The update in ontology comes at the expense of its de-essentialization⁴. That is, while traditionally ontology is understood as the doctrine of existence, in Heidegger's view, ontology is explained as the study of the relation of existence to human essence. Ontology turns to the study of the essence of existence for man. Thus, the ontological turn goes beyond the definition of being as a substance. As a result, man is seen as the substance of the existence of the world. Ontology turns from the study of the essence of existence to the study of essence for us. Here, the concept of "we" refers to mind, body, language, symbols, authority, social structures and similar human phenomena. As a result, ontology

² Белл Д. Грядущее постиндустриальное общество: опыт социального прогнозирования. М.: Академия, 2004.; Гидденс Э. Устроение общества: очерк теории структуризации. М.: Акад. проект, 2005.; Кемеров В.Е. Общество, социальность, полисубъектность. М.: Акад. проект, 2012.; Уэбстер Ф. Теории информационного общества. М.: Аспект пресс, 2004.

³ Хайдеггер М. Время и бытие: статьи и выступления. М.: Республика, 1993. С. 93-111.

⁴ Нанси Ж.-Л. Бытие, единичное и множественное. Минск: Логвинов, 2004. С. 67-75.

is manifested in the form of teachings of various directions, such as anthropological, sociological, linguistic, hermeneutic, and communicative.

Such a turn creates a condition of impossibility for ontology. Because, taking into account that existence is always indirectly manifested, as a result of the limitation or cessation of this mediation, ontology becomes an "impossible project"⁵. And precisely because of this, existence becomes a pressing problem both as a point that eludes us and as the limit of discourse about essence. Considering these reasons shows that the renewal of ontology is related to its departure from the limits of ontotheology. After all, if ontology was earlier ontotheology, now the question arises as to what kind of doctrine it will be. If ontology remains a doctrine that explains the reason for the existence of the world, then the transition to the question of existence should not mean a transition to a different ontology.

The third is the formation of a new epistemology that differs from the boundaries of essentialism and constructivism. They represent opposing positions on issues related to the relationship between knowledge and reality, thought and reality. From the point of view of essentialism, essence has a stable, unchanging basis. Because of this, the essence remains true to itself, despite all the changes and twists and turns of events. Knowledge ultimately leads to knowing this principle. The essence of any events comes from this basis expressed in knowledge. In other words, the world is always determined by reality. On the contrary, constructivism recognizes the integral relationship between the subject and the object of knowledge, and based on this, poses the problem of the relationship between thought and reality. Many forms of constructivism are distinguished by this relational nature.

The new epistemology is distinguished by its non-essentialist but realistic explanation of the world. In it, the world is understood not as a static collection of things presented in knowledge, but as an emerging and ongoing process, reality. The world is made up of differences. The rate of change, the flow of matter and energy gives rise to geological, biological and social forms of existence. After all, existence has its own resources that generate its forms. Morphogenesis is connected with self-organizing processes that respond to the origin of reality⁶.

The characteristics that indicate the development trends of the socio-philosophical theory at the current stage serve to more clearly imagine the uniqueness of the philosophical understanding of social reality and the development perspective. At the same time, one of the issues that gives a specific goal and direction to the perspective of the development of modern socio-philosophical theory is the characteristics and trends of the relationship between science and religion. It is known that the debates about the relationship between science and religion and their interrelationship have been going on from history to the present day. An example of this is the fact that some scientists put forward the ideas that religion and science are contradictory, that where there is religion, there is no science, and where there is science, there is no religion. According to the sources, the emergence of such views is connected with the activities of the medieval Catholic Church. The Inquisition that reigned in those times caused thousands of innocent victims. It is well known that scientific research and scientists were strictly persecuted by the Church.

As a result of the beginning of the reformation movements, the emergence of superstitions and secular trends in European society, science came out from under the influence of religion. Nevertheless, the injustices committed against representatives of the scientific field left their mark on the creative activity of scientists. After all, in the scientific environment of that time, some

⁵ Деррида Ж. Структура, знак и игра в дискурсе гуманитарных наук. М.: Акад. проект, 2007. С. 89-94.

⁶ Керимов Т.Х. Социальная философия: учебник. Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал.ун-та, 2018. С.128-139.

conclusions were put forward that science and religion could not be interconnected, that these two concepts could not be reconciled. At the same time, it should be noted that another group of scientists who made a great contribution to the development of natural-scientific views interpreted religion and science as mutually compatible phenomena. According to them, religion does not deny science, and science does not deny religion, on the contrary, religion promotes the study of science, and deep study of science does not mean denying faith.

Classification of science according to religious and secular principles continued as a result of the development of the secularization process, the fall of the theocratic states, superstition, and the ideas of the enlightenment. However, in some cases, the misconceptions that secular scholars should be completely irreligious and that religious and secular scholars are polar opposites were also expressed. It is also known to many that in some periods and regions, ideas such as "religion is the enemy of science and development, human superstition" have risen to the level of ideology.

History shows that a person's pursuit of science does not prevent his religious beliefs, and his faith does not prevent him from becoming a scientist. On the contrary, acquiring both religious and worldly sciences leads a person to spiritual perfection. After all, as our first president Islam Karimov stated in his work "High Spirituality - Invincible Power", "Unless worldly and religious values complement each other, it will not be easy to find complete answers to today's difficult and complex questions." Today, the relationship between science and religion is reaching a new level. The centuries-long conflicts ended, and the period of mutual cooperation between these two areas, important for humanity, began. Now the issues of ensuring the balance between science and religion are becoming more and more important. After all, humanity could not reach complete maturity and happiness even in the period when religious superstitions prevailed and science was depressed, or, on the contrary, when secularism prevailed and religion was completely denied. It is being increasingly realized that progress can be achieved only by combining religious and secular sciences.

Currently, the existence of theology departments in the world's leading universities along with various secular faculties, the establishment of religious research centers, and the fact that citizens in almost all countries of the world are declared to have equal rights regardless of their religious beliefs are examples of the increasing harmony of religiosity and secularism in the life of society.

After the independence of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the harmony of religious and secular values was recognized as one of the important principles. Independence started a period of radical changes in all spheres of social life, including spiritual life. The attitude towards religion has changed radically, the militant atheist policy towards religion has been abolished, and freedom of conscience has been guaranteed by law.

One of the important principles determining the relationship between religion and the secular state in the dialectical relationship between religion and society is to objectively and scientifically study and forecast the changes in the field of religion, and based on this, create a wider opportunity for the development of positive processes and prevent negative situations. Another principle expressing the attitude of the state to religion is that the state recognizes religion as an integral part of the people's spirituality. The secular state's approach to religion has two important features: the legal status of religious people and the implementation of laws on religious denominations in state-run events.

These issues have been resolved in our constitution and it fully meets international legal and regulatory requirements. Article 31 of our Constitution, which provides for the same conditions for those who believe in any religion and those who do not believe in any religion, is expressed as following: "Freedom of conscience is guaranteed to all. Everyone has the right to believe in any religion or not to believe in any religion. Forced indoctrination of religious views is not allowed."

In this rule, the main characteristics of the secular state's attitude towards religion are expressed:

- respect for the religious feelings of believers; recognizing religious beliefs as the private matter of citizens or their associations;
- guarantee equal rights of citizens who adhere to religious beliefs and those who do not adhere to them and prevent their persecution;
- spiritual revival, universal moral values the need to find ways to communicate with different religious associations in order to use their opportunities in decision-making;
- Recognizing that religion cannot be used for subversive purposes. Features of secularism, religious tolerance, equal treatment of all religions, cooperation with religion in the development of society are implemented on the basis of these principles.

In general, ideas and views on the relationship between religion and science have a long and complicated path of development. In fact, it should be noted that the idea that religion is the enemy of science, and science is the enemy of religion, arises due to a lack of knowledge of both phenomena. People who did not know the true essence of religion denied science, and those whose knowledge was shallow and did not understand their field began to deny religion. Today, the main task of social theory, especially the philosophy of religion, is to objectively illuminate the dialectic of religion and science by pointing out these errors.

Nowadays, the most important task of any field of social science, including the philosophy of religion, is to scientifically explain the moderate relationship between religious and secular knowledge, to reveal its laws and features. For this, it is desirable to find opportunities to harmonize the relations of religion and secular sciences within the framework of universal goals and interests. After all, universal human development itself requires focusing the ideological-theoretical capabilities of social philosophical sciences on solving this issue.

References

1. Поппер К. Нищета историцизма. М.: Прогресс, 1993.;
2. Тоффлер Э. Третья волна. М.: АСТ, 2002.;
3. Уайт Х. Метаистория. Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 2002.;
4. Фукуяма Ф. Конец истории и последний человек. М.: Аст, 2015.;
5. Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций. М.: АСТ, 2003.;
6. Шпенглер О. Закат Европы: очерки морфологии мировой истории. М.: Мысль, 1993.;
7. Ясперс К. Смысл и назначение истории. М.: Республика, 1994.
8. Белл Д. Грядущее постиндустриальное общество: опыт социального прогнозирования. М.: Академия, 2004.;
9. Гидденс Э. Устройство общества: очерк теории структуризации. М.: Акад. проект, 2005.;
10. Кемеров В.Е. Общество, социальность, полисубъектность. М.: Акад. проект, 2012.;
11. Уэбстер Ф. Теории информационного общества. М.: Аспект пресс, 2004.
12. Хайдеггер М. Время и бытие: статьи и выступления. М.: Республика, 1993. С. 93-111.
13. Нанси Ж.-Л. Бытие, единичное и множественное. Минск: Логвинов, 2004. С. 67-75.
14. Деррида Ж. Структура, знак и игра в дискурсе гуманитарных наук. М.: Акад. проект, 2007. С. 89-94.
15. Керимов Т.Х. Социальная философия: учебник. Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 2018. С.128-139.