

An aerial view of a city skyline, likely New York City, with a purple overlay. The text is centered and reads:

***JOURNAL
OF INTELLECTUAL
PROPERTY
AND HUMAN RIGHTS***

ISSN 2720-6882

OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL

ACADEMICZONE.NET

THE PRINCIPLES OF PRAGMATISM AND THEIR SOCIO-
PHILOSOPHICAL SUBSTANTIATION

Shirinov Anvar Qanoatovich
Senior lecturer of Bukhara state university

Abstract: In the following article the principles of pragmatism and their socio-philosophical substantiation. The clarifications on some printouts are created by researchers with scientific-theoretical knowledge and experimental experience in the field are analysed based on the comparative data.

Keywords: pragmatism, social being, structuralism, determinism, sensualism, relativism, empiricism, socio-philosophical substantiation

Introduction. A certain doctrine, claiming calling to be a school, is that scientific research should have its own printouts. “Principle” implies the procedures, rules and requirements for their application in gnoseological research. Printouts are created by researchers with scientific-theoretical knowledge and experimental experience in the field. The pragmatism prints while it is a tradition to start Ch.S. Pierce’s legacy, it is scientifically substantiating them being carried out in the works of W. James. His treatise “Principles of psychology” clarifies the problem.

At a glance it is. It seems that W. James is thinking about psychology, it refers to psychological topics, subjects. He studies human behavior from the point of view of motivation, ustanovka, feeling, perception and its transfer to activity, interests and interests again and again, sometimes structuralism, sometimes determinism, sometimes sensualism. This research will eventually lead the scientist to philosophical observations.

Methods. So many people think that it is how he first recognized Jems as a psychologist. It is as long as the goals and doubts in human behavior end up matters related to trust. W. James comes to the conclusion:

“I have such an opinion that it is accepted as the last question of philosophy when it is published. It brings the theory that the practical life of each person begins with a single point. He solves all the antinomies and contradictions, and anyone who has heard of him can say: “Yes, it’s a dachshund! It’s exactly what I believed and I live in eternity, coming without expression! All that is not entangled by daily

observations, higher than tiny specks, attracts and does not give a grip, here he is stable. Finally ends the dissatisfaction in the principle, and without hindrance begins clarity, joy and forces. Yes, friends, I have such an idea!”

Traces of arrogance appear in these words, a person aware of the features of philosophical research does not dare to say “the last question of philosophy”. At the level of a simple, everyday search for philosophy, a person who simply lowered himself to the stage of behavior, interests, as the pragmatists did, can promise such a “word”. If the “last question” of philosophy was said, there would be no need for further research, science would not have achieved its goal and left the rest of the research.

In general, primitive understanding, extreme simplification, immersion in primitivism are encountered in pragmatists in the field of complex scientific features, aspects of scientific research that change and change according to the dynamics of social being. In the above opinion it. W. James strengthens his conclusions with the following conclusion. He writes: “any philosophical confirmation can become a certain concrete result of our future active or non-active practical experience”.

In this place it is more clearly emphasized that it should be concrete before the experiment is active”. Apparently, it seems that James aims to make philosophy not in metaphysical observation, but in close proximity to certain behaviors, views that should lead to certain results. The pursuit of the result of practical experiments, the direction of any thought, science, research to the pragmatic goal is the priority approach in its research. So, when Ch.S. Pierce and Jems substantiates pragmatism as a separate philosophy, doctrine, they see that all sub-views, searches are subjects that serve behavior, specific purpose, activity. Hence, orientation to the practical result is the chief printmaking of the philosophy of pragmatism.

The philosophy of pragmatism simply does not reject metaphysical observations, it is a supporter of the fact that it is based on any thought, in a mushah with a concrete fact, purpose and behavior. Any phenomenon can be metaphysically based on this, such currents as kvietism, relativism, empiricism, objectivism, subjectivism, modernism, formed in philosophy, ideological views are examples.

But what exactly do these “isms” give to social existence, to the life of Man and society? Those who traditionally understand philosophy do not want to hear this question, because in their eyes philosophy is higher than social practical needs as the “father of all Sciences”, a person who is not inclined to such thinking is called upon to argue that he is not able to understand philosophy. Pragmatism denies this claim.

So, one of the prints of pragmatism is that philosophy is aimed at updating the understanding of traditionalism. Now philosophy can not be considered a long journey from social life, it will be a sphere that will serve the development of Man and society, a concrete practical result. If philosophy goes this way, then metaphysical, sometimes without a head and an end does not fit into disputes, any dispute is solved simply by looking at the practical result. A rule that is simple, concise and does not leave a place for other arguments arises, as we know the practical result the norm of gnoseological research. After all, at this time, such teachings as the ongoing debate in philosophy, thautological views, the spiritualist and the “pure idea” do not easily find their own solution?

Ch.S. Pierce somehow felt that U.Ch. Jems does not leave room for metaphysical observations. In his particular thoughts, this anxiety is felt. He writes: “If we approach philosophy from the point of view of its practical application, most of those involved in philosophy lose interest in it. It will be necessary for us to say goodbye to them. In all areas of pure science it is necessary to do so”.

It is not difficult to notice that in these words there is a great danger for metaphysical observations. It was a tragedy for science, of course, that it lived for centuries, that philosophy was an interesting field of thought, that it evoked different approaches and arguments, and even in a speculative and scholastic way, that it enriched consciousness, perception and thinking, and abandoned the life-long tradition. U.When Jems called his method “radical empiricism”, such “threat to metaphysics” was aroused.

Speculative in philosophy, confusing and debates without a beginning and an end, in which there are certain pronouns, the conflict awakens. It is the intention to eliminate this dependence overwhelmed U. James. He saw this in practice, in usefulness, as a result. “In my opinion, he writes that, radical empiricism, if it hurts something in accordance with the print of pure experience and the pragmatic method, will bypass such confusion or, if not, will reduce them”.

This was actually an expression of discontent with the speculations in philosophy, the aspects, views that forced the discovery of consciousness, contemplation various “isms” that evoked inefficientar controversy. “Radical empiricism”. That’s exactly what niche has “radical nihilism”. But the difference between them is that it is, Jems views are against the traditions of philosophy, F. Nisshe views on social life.

The latter is wider, it covers the entire European social life, culture, religion

and morality, radically changing themtirik, offering absolute new values, the creation of a being. So the orientation of philosophy towards empiricism, in this regard, even making it, as it was proposed, “radical empiricism”, was the second print of pragmatism. In any case it is. U. Jems’s “radical empiricism” “leads us to such a conclusion”. In this case it is noteworthy to mention the treatise of U. James “Essays on radical empiricism”. In this work, it is noted that activity is a “vital expression” of behavior, the appearance of human emotional reactions, associative relations, if it is given a philosophical direction and a pragmatic goal, then there can be a practical result. Radical empiricism becomes an object of necessity due to a lack of practical purpose and result, affects the system and essence of views.

The third principle of pragmatism is associated with the relationship of the subject-object. This is actually manifested in the desire of a person to the outside world, to know, to understand and to find his place in this being. Does a person know the existence, how much does he know, how much this knowledge is measured by what norms, why does a person not want to restrain the process of cognition, but to continue (continue) its course again and again? Are these processes of cognition only the subject’s desire or are they also influenced by external forces? Such questions also prompted pragmatists to think, to search. It can not be denied that it was given to various metaphysical and psychognoseological observations until they were called upon to obtain a practical result as the main norm.

In the philosophy of pragmatism, the subject is regarded as an active creator, seeker, aspiring force. Those who seek a positive justification from the philosophy of pragmatism basically bring this approach as evidence. To look at a person as an active subject is not in fact a novelty for philosophy, Socratic ethics and dialectics confirm this. For Plato, man is a “two-legged-minded being”, for Aristotle, man is a “political being”, he is a creative, thinking person and a noble seeker from entering into various relationships.

In the center of the theology of Thomas Aquinas stands the experiences of man, his transtsendental senses, as well as with God. rationalism of Decartus, Bacon’s empiricism have made man a subject of cognition, while Gelvesiy and Feyerbach’s anthropology have made man a “living person” responsible for his activities, searches, mental perception and experiences. Pragmatists could not be unaware of these studies, the scientific results and recommendations in them. However, they took a different approach to the subject and his Universe, relationship with the object, in accordance with their own conceptions.

Pragmatists recognize the individuality of the subject “freedom of will” (iroda erkinligi). Experience and practical result can not reach its goal, to be such a weak-willed. The pragmatist feature of experience and practice makes human behavior desirable, useful and purposeful. Activity and activeness also show the nature of the subject as an expression of this experience, the “object determinant” of practice, what imagination it possesses, knowledge and social experiences. Free will (“iroda erkinligi”) has an optimistic character, when the identity of the subject manifests this will. The F. Nietzsche called this will a “will to power”, and pragmatists interpret it as a psychological reality. This approach of pragmatists does not correspond to their views on the practical result, concrete behavior and concrete goal.

Especially their psychology leads to contradictory conclusions when a person approaches the “free will” with fatalism. As a result, they are forced to express their opinion about the Divine Will by the human will. It’s him. James makes extensive observations about this, but he does not see that, in the end, there are differences between human and divine Wills. Even though he notes that the divine will is a priority, a person does not put the question on the agenda, does not discuss, whether it is his command full of Will, or whether he himself will come as an independent reality.

He, on the one hand, recognizes fatalism, on the other hand, sees a person as an “interested subject”, an active being with his own goals and pragmatic plans. The fact is that divine fatalism presupposes the transfer of human destiny into the hands of divinity, in which man’s “will landkinligi” becomes a dry, psychological expression. It is true that “Our thoughts determine our lives and our lives determine the world” (our thoughts define our deeds, and our actions define the world) mentions W. James. In our actions, our associations are dictated, our actions are the expression of these associations, we are portrayed by these feelings of who we are and how we are striving for a pragmatic goal, how much this image acquires object, reality, it shows confidence, idea, result.

It should not be forgotten that in the philosophy of pragmatism the subject comes in two conflicting roles, the first is that he is a person with consciousness, will, freedom, psychological setting, motivation and his own interest. In fact, this is psychology. Whatever a person does, he does it according to the influence of these psychological factors. Expressing the position of pragmatists K. Manheim writes: “Being dumb, he can not say anything about himself, instead of him we are

the effects of a certain need. Each result has its own merits, that is, the axiological essence, appreciate the behavior and achievements due to it. Even the arrival of knowledge, knowledge as a separate activity, intellectual activity, is a value.

The arrival of behavior, results and achievements as a value the research in pragmatism is directed towards social problems, school, education, management, family relations, the problems of formation of “Intellectual will” (Intellectual capacity) in people U. James It is widely discussed by the J. Dyui.

If Ch.S. Pierce when seeks through “doubt and trust” to reveal the essence of the processes of cognition inherent in man, the clarification gnoseological structure. U. James pursued the circle of psychology through practice, achievement, pragmatic goal, motivation, interest, need, opened the way to evaluate them as values. The J. Dewey turned not only philosophy, but also the life of society, social consciousness and imagination, the ideals of upbringing into a pragmatic goal, gave a pragmatic direction to the relationship between man and society.

REFERENCES:

1. Dewey J. Byhezinsky Z. Between two ages. America is role in the Technotronic Era. N.Y. The Viking Press. 1970.
2. Dewey J. Theory of Valuation. International Encyclopedia Unifid Science. Vol. II. P
3. Рассел Б. История Западной философии. Новосибирск: НГУ, 1990