

PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPT OF SOCIETY AND ITS STRUCTURE

Mukhammadjonov Salokhiddin

Adhamjonov Mukhammadali

Madrahimov Begzod

Key words: Subsystem, existence, society, ideal, construction, production, social relations, basis and superstructure, socio-economic formation.

A philosophical analysis of society should not lead to the usurpation of the rights and territory of other social sciences. This should be precisely a philosophical analysis of social life - from the standpoint of revealing not particular, but general laws of movement and development of society, etc. The starting point of the philosophical analysis of society, the construction of its theoretical, ideal model is the consideration of society as a special, specific subsystem of objective reality. In philosophy, society is understood as a way of organizing the joint existence of people.

Society is a special subsystem of objective reality, a specific, social form of the movement of matter. The originality of this subsystem of being lies, first of all, in the fact that the history of society is made by people. In living nature, for example, at best, only organisms adapt to natural conditions; society does not adapt, in the course of transforming practical activity, the substances of nature and its processes to meet their needs. Activity, therefore, is a mode of existence of the social, for any change in the social, i.e. its movement is realized through activity.

Philosophical analysis of society has as its goal, on the basis of the study of concrete historical societies or their states, the construction of an ideal model of society using a whole system of philosophical categories. Within the framework of the Marxist concept, these include the categories of activity, production, social relations, basis and

superstructure, socio-economic formation, etc. Within the framework of the phenomenological model-category, interaction, agent, social connection, social knowledge, etc.

Thus, in the philosophical concept, society is a collection of people connected by a system of social relations that are formed on the basis of the whole variety of socially significant activities.

3. Brief historical and philosophical analysis

In the course of historical development, the broadest, actually philosophical concept of society was developed as the total activity of people aimed at the production, maintenance and reproduction of their life.

This approach was already outlined in ancient philosophy. For example, Democritus believed that people at first simply used the gifts of nature, not differing in this respect from animals. Under the influence of need and natural needs, they developed their hands, mind and quick wit, learned how to make and use tools, build dwellings and sew clothes. Aristotle called man a social being, a political animal. He considered the state as a developed community, an association of communities, and the community as a developed family. In the philosophy of modern times, in particular in Hobbes, two states of human society were distinguished: natural and civil. In the state of nature, there was a continuous struggle of all against all according to the formula "man is a wolf to man," and strength coincided with right. Since such a state was contrary to the natural desire of people for self-preservation, they concluded an agreement according to which everyone transferred part of their rights to the state, as a result of which civil society arose.

There are many factors (or driving forces) that cause changes in society. In this respect, one could say that the "factor theory" is correct. Yes, everything would be so if, firstly, a hierarchy was established, the subordination of one factor to others (for example, productive forces and traditions are not in equilibrium when considering such a "change" as the transition to automation or computers). This question is important and needs to be investigated. Secondly, in the "theory of factors" with its main thesis "there are many

factors, all factors are equal", the main link, that is, the leading, main driving force, is not singled out. And as such, a person, his labor activity, should be recognized. "History," notes V. S. Barulin, "is natural, because it is subject to the objective logic of social transformations, at the same time, this regularity itself is realized only through the activities of people. If there is no such activity, there is no society, no history. This fact in itself is evidence of the fundamental importance of human activity in society. "In our opinion, the driving forces of society are the activities of people..." [9]

As a matter of fact, K. Kh. Momdzhyan also defends the same point of view. He substantiates the position according to which the substance of society, studied under the prism of social philosophy, is human activity. Human activity is a form of self-movement, or, in other words, a kind of information-directed activity of self-regulating adaptive systems; it is associated with the synthesis of purposefulness and labor as a special type of adaptation to the environment, adaptive-adapting activity. A person has a primary attribute - consciousness, with which instrumental activity is associated. The simplest holistic manifestation of social life is social action, inseparable from social interaction and collectivity. Human activity should be seen as the most important driving force of society. "Whatever the social philosopher studies the principles of the structural organization of society or the functional mediation of spheres of social life, the dynamics of history or the principles of its typology, he studies the same human activity in its various manifestations and specifications" [10].

It is important to note that if we take a person, his activity, work, interests and much more, inextricably linked with his being, as the true foundation, or substance, of society as a material (as a whole) system, then many of the above concepts will find fair moments in themselves. , really noteworthy driving forces of society and changes in the mode of production, and population, and the traditions of nations, and the character of prominent personalities, and much more. Only if the activity (labor) of a person is in the center of the very essence of society (or in the center of the driving forces of society), then all other

factors will be due to this factor, i.e., located either on the fragmentary-essential or on the phenomenological levels of reality.

Having considered a number of concepts concerning the driving forces (or sources) of social development, we come to the following general conclusion. The most acceptable solution to the question of the driving forces of the development of society, if considered at the phenomenological and fragmentary-essential levels, is the recognition of the theory of factors (as a synthesis of many concepts), and at the total-essential, i.e., the deepest, fundamental level, the acceptance of the anthropocentric concept of society.

Gegel, in contrast to the contractual theory, considered "civil society" as a sphere of economic relations, which he derived from the concept of law.

Marx believed that society does not consist of individuals, but expresses the totality of those connections and relations in which individuals are to each other society, i.e. the person himself in his social relations.

Modern Western social philosophy also considers society not as a collection of separate individuals, but as a joint action of people integrated into social groups and systems. The philosophical concept of society includes two main features: 1) society is a separate part of nature; 2) being connected with the whole, this part develops according to its own specific laws, not reducible to the laws that are studied by natural science.

Society is an open dynamic system that carries out a continuous exchange of matter and energy with the environment. Being a dynamic system, society constantly changes its state, develops in time, and this development is of a probabilistic nature. Society includes both material and spiritual components that are in a complex interpenetration interaction. In philosophical science, there are both natural and teleological interpretations of systemicity and the development of society. In the first case, the development of society is described as a natural-historical process, which is based on certain patterns. In the second - as a process aimed at achieving by someone (God, providence, fate) a predetermined goal. The above interpretations are mutually exclusive.

Obviously, society is the most complex of all systems known to man. First of all, society is a hierarchical, multi-level system. Each element or subsystem of this system can be considered as a relatively independent system, which in turn includes its own subsystems. At the same time, society acts as a kind of integrity in which, according to Kant's just remark, the whole dominates over the particular. The properties of a system as a whole cannot be reduced to the sum of the properties of its constituent elements.

Generally accepted is the allocation in society as an integral system of the following subsystems - economic, social, political, spiritual. Let's take a look at their brief description.

Economic subsystem.

The economic subsystem of society is the economy, which in a broad sense is defined as a way of producing material life, including the totality of production relations inherent in a given social system.

Social subsystem.

The term "sociality" means the public, citizenship, mutual relations and obligations in public life. Under the "social" is understood everything that relates to the varieties of society - family-related, national-ethnic, territorial communities. This also includes the problems of structuring society or dividing it into groups according to various social characteristics - class, professional, demographic, etc.

Political subsystem.

Politics in the broadest sense of this term means a consciously pursued line of behavior of a social subject in relation to other subjects or objects.

Spiritual subsystem.

Man is the only creature on earth who is endowed not only with bodily but also with spiritual life. A person not only perceives the world around him with the help of his senses, he is able to think logically, comprehending everything that exists according to the standards of truth, justice and beauty. Without a thinking person there can be no spiritual production, no science, no art, no religion. However, it would be wrong to reduce

the spiritual life of society, social consciousness, to the mechanical sum of the consciousness of individual individuals. The relationship between individual and social consciousness is a complex problem that does not have an unambiguous solution. From the point of view of objective idealists, such as Plato or Hegel, the primary and objective is the superhuman divine consciousness, which gives rise to nature, society and man himself with his individual consciousness. And this latter is only a faint reflection of the absolute in its fullness and truth of divine ideas. Essentially the same thing is preached by religion.