

Communion is a Sociogenetic Aspect of Human Nature

Bobomurod Tukhtasinov

Teacher of Namangan State University

ABSTRACT: in this article, the important role of man in the life of society, the interconnection of the Social Chain “man-Sosium-Society-State”. The earlier theories of philosophers and philosophers of the period of social development of Man have taken place.

KEYWORD: liberal-democracy, "man-socioeconomic-Society-State", "primitive community", “linearity”, "sociogenetic code"

The human soul, intellect, was interested in the Times and space, what the state is, the mystery of its existence for so many centuries. There are a lot of doctrines and theories that deny one another, even in a series of issues such as whether it is necessary or not, not only in terms of its early beginnings as well as the time it came into being, and also in terms of socio-cultural causes and motivations. The controversy in this regard still remains intense. In fact, this controversy, especially liberal-the idea of democratism, has again escalated as the social project looks more influential than other doctrines. Some politicians, even among the representatives of the scientific community, have become skeptical of the current potential and future of the state as a form of social life and the organization of activities. Maybe there’s some conspiracy influence here as well - but it’s something else, it has nothing to do with us.

As we have noted, the reason for the interest of the political world and the scientific community in the problem is elsewhere: that is, there is no society without a state, and vice versa. Although the state and society are not one in the same - they can be called two sides of the same coin. After all, society is a very high level of social cohesion of many people, and it is precisely because of the state that it has risen to the level of society because of its self-comparison and solidarity with it. Man, who is a fundamental, basic element of society, and economics, politics, culture and education, which are the main spheres of social life, can be understood from the same point of view, and the reason for their connection with the state can be understood.

If we go back to the above-mentioned generalization, we encounter a specific social "chain": "Human-Society-Society-State". In many cases, it has been imagined and interpreted in a straight line, that is, from the bottom to the top, in relation to the "social relay", requiring that one be replaced by the other. We see this as a complication of understanding the development that has dominated science and philosophy for centuries as a "linear" trend from bottom to top. According to him, Human first appeared and lived in a state of semi-savagery, that is, "prehistoric" vanity for millions of years, imagining neither society, nor society, nor the state. Human has remained unchanged both mentally and physiologically. The concept of a "primitive community" has been attributed to that period, which spans millions of years. Therefore, it is difficult to compare the concepts of "historical

stage" or "human" and "community" with that period. It's not about living here, it's about existence, and life, as Gobbs puts it, is about "everyone fighting everyone."

Based on the logic of the doctrine of "linearity" (it is impossible to connect its formation only with Marxism), a group of semi-savages unknowingly "founded" the family, society and finally the state in a state of consciousness and thinking in the form of some immutable objective mechanical exchange. To put it more simply, those gangs turn out to be spontaneously united into family, society and state without thinking about the passage of time. According to this theory of "linearity", development is infinitely linear, which means that the state, as an emerging social factor, will one day be eliminated.

We are far from saying that the above situation is completely nonsense. Knowing the secrets of the universe and humanity, striving for the truth is an endless process. So whether he is right or less right; regardless of by whom and when it arose, every conclusion is this or that form of understanding of society, of man. Interestingly, it also serves as a springboard, motivating the emergence of a second idea that is superior to itself, slightly more perfect from a scientific point of view. However, in the first half of the twentieth century, it became clear that the origins of two consecutive world wars were rooted in the human factor, rather than economic or political factors, and in the development of the human problem brought. Rather than the objective factors and laws that move everything, the obvious power of subjective (spiritual, spiritual, emotional) factors in the direction of human thinking and consciousness became apparent. This transformation, in turn, was especially evident in existentialism and anthropological, that is, human philosophy, which are manifestations of non-classical and postclassical philosophical processes.

This philosophical transformation has, of course, led, first of all, to a new attitude towards the human world, recognizing that it has a great power capable of radically changing many aspects. Today, Darwin's theory of the evolution of the individual has proved to be just a personal assumption. This process has shown the need for a unique approach to the world, a new understanding of its elements, including a different approach to the origin of the state. Opinions that are close to the truth about the role of man, but have been pushed aside by the theory of "linearity" or the concept of economic monism, have returned to the bosom of philosophy.

In this regard, if we pay attention to a plot by K.A. Helvetius, we think that some things will become clear in the "Human-State" system. Man is by nature both a herbivorous and a carnivorous creature. However, because he is weak and poorly armed, he is likely to become a victim of more powerful, greedy creatures. In order to find food or to escape the onslaught of tigers and lions, man has to unite with other people," said the thinker, referring to a fundamental social imperative. According to the famous French philosopher, we are primarily interested in the inner need, motivation, that is, conscious behavior associated with the rapprochement of people. Here, the transformation of individual aspirations into group aspirations is important, as they work together to achieve a common goal - the security of themselves and each member of the group, as well as to find a solution to a common problem. This required a unique factor of consciousness and thinking, purposeful aspiration, which is unique to the individual, to man, to him.

The French theologian P.T. de Charden (late 19th - early 20th century) concludes: "The sudden leaps in human morphology and the consequent unprecedented upheavals in all aspects of life ... turn man into Man, and so is the paradox." a great thinker. It refers to the fact that man was suddenly endowed with consciousness and thinking (attributed to these countless millennia in the classical teachings), and from then on he became a man who cared about himself, aspired to goodness, prosperity, and what he could achieve.

However, no matter how much potential an individual has, he was forced to realize that he could not protect and preserve himself, that his mind and thinking had no choice but to unite with people like him. From the earliest stages of socialization, Man realizes that there can be no shift without partnering with others. This means that all the social aspects that appear in the human brain and then become a practice, including the state, originate from this source, that social cooperation, the collective nature of the human race, and the state itself is the essence of this community. When Aristotle once said, "Man is a collective being," he was referring to a unique, living fact, which suggests that philosophy has no second alternative.

In thinking about what a secret industry man is, we have come to the conclusion that the essence of other social groups, elements, including the "state", is man, his aspirations, interests, goals, the product of power. Because all of this is human and man-made, it started with man and goes back to man again. In particular, it would be correct to approach the state from this methodological point of view. After all, the deeper the understanding of human nature - the more clearly the processes associated with it, including the emergence of the state. Its emergence, its functioning as a social reality, in short, is characterized by the nature of man, his labor, his level of imagination of the world. Hence, the issue of human-specific collectiveness, the tendency to community, is of particular importance here. From this point of view, the above general situation can be treated as a stability, that is, a law, capable of finding the end of the thread. Because the state, which is one of the highest levels of community, is the end result.

If collectivization or socialization is solely and exclusively human in nature, it is necessary to understand when and under what circumstances it occurred, and what played a decisive role here. In this regard, although it focuses on a different process, it is useful to pay attention to one of Gegel's ideas. "The worldview," writes the thinker, "enters the stage of life only when the spirit of the people is freed from the pain of indifference, drowsiness and primitiveness, and many other phenomena." Here the word is based on the fact that the beginning of worldview, environment, perception of the world is associated with the emergence of the mind in the individual, man's submission to social necessity, adaptation to natural necessity, in short, a completely new attitude to the world. The formation of the collective skill and value in man, his belief that there is nothing else that can reach him, naturally gives rise to his need and desire for an acceptable, universally acceptable form. Only then can a person be able to achieve his political goals and objectives, such as protecting others through self-preservation, which is the essence of the state, the nature of statehood.

Here, the second aspect of the human race, that is, the immanent, "organic" feature associated with the provision of their individual plans and interests, is of particular importance, first of all, the realization of their dreams by serving society. its essence is that it can clearly express its political and social character, otherwise it is nothing more than a being deprived of the level of ascension to the level of rationality that cannot go beyond living only through the senses. Speaking about the inner motivation of the direction of social relations, Gegel draws attention to one important point: it is necessary, "said the thinker. In Gegel's philosophy, it is a priority to treat the human race according to the degree of harmony with society, and if necessary, it is reasonable to call this aspect the "sociogenetic code" of the individual.

Hegel's predecessor, the Frenchman Claude Adrian Helvetius, spoke of human nature, emphasizing that "interests and needs lie at the heart of the community," meaning that community can be achieved through interaction, if it is not understood. The idea that "man is a social being", which was once expressed by Aristotle and later became an aphorism, may have in some way led to the above conclusion of Helvetius. As we can see, social processes - whether they are positive or negative - are based on natural needs and goals and interests. To confirm our point, let us look at an idea in J.-J.

Russo's On the Causes of Inequality. "If we look carefully at the various coups and the growing inequalities associated with them," he writes, manifests itself as the final stage in the process of increasing inequality. ”

On the surface, our statement above seems to apply to all aspects of the community of individuals (from the wild to the family). Only here it is necessary to understand a huge difference, which is to bring needs and interests into one system, to create from them a great power for the common good, for a stable life, a phenomenon unique to man. This power can be the perfect culmination of collective evolution from the state to the state through state power. In our opinion, it is here and at this time that the social aspiration, the social process becomes political, the aspiration of individuals for prosperity, the "political field" emerges as a result of combining political power and potential for a common goal. At the same time, Aristotle's "political being" is at the center of political consciousness and thinking, political purpose and practice. The state, on the other hand, "must create all the conditions for the realization of the immense potential, power, which is immanent to human nature, and for its daily practice, and this is its only fundamental goal." Politics gave birth to the state - which in turn turned collective action into politics. Through this, humanity became a self-organizing organism.

An interesting problem arises here. We are talking about the relationship between members of society - citizens - on the one hand, and the state, which unites, regulates, controls, on the other. After all, whether people voluntarily relinquish their freedoms after uniting in a state is not. In the form and manner of society in which the state and society have always differed from each other, the agreements between them will be strengthened by a number of norms and practices. The most important of them is that if the main indicator for society is morality, on the contrary, the system of legal restraint is a priority for the state. Rather, in the context of society and the state, moral and legal norms are interchangeable: for society, moral principles come first, and law comes second. This principle has not emerged today. It has long been the meaning of the state with society. The state is an instrument created not to create legal norms for society, but to increase their effectiveness in inter-citizen dialogue, to raise relations to a higher level, to ensure common goals and interests, to establish prosperity.

Speaking of sociality, its stages and tasks, Gegel clarifies the problem as follows: "Civil society," the thinker continues, "is the separation formed between the family and the state, around it. Although civil society developed much later than the state, as a separate entity it requires the existence of the state. The state, in turn, requires an independent second social unit in front of it in order for its existence to have a place in space. And it is civil society. The state, as a unit of different people from a socio-spiritual point of view, determines the status of society as another commonality. Also, the main goal in civil society is that everyone lives only for himself, and that others do not matter to him. One does not take responsibility for another. But society, as a social factor, cannot fully achieve the plan that its member, the individual (not a citizen), communicates with others. The private goal will remain the same. ”

From the point of view of the philosopher, it should also not be concluded that the various parallel existing forms and manifestations of social community, each for its own sake, can exist without going to dialogue. On the contrary, because of the need for each other through separation, society and the state will be directed towards the basic, the only common need for all, the common good. Society and the state are each separate object of study (for sociologists, political scientists). But in the whirlpool of internal structural differences in the form of two forms of social community, especially in today's turbulent times, it is impossible to live long. It is true that in the very ancient times of history, the prince, monarch, emperor, caliph, ruler, viceroy - on the one hand, and the people - on the

other, lived in sharp separation. This was typical of the epochs of slavery and feudalism, but the kingdom could not survive without its subjects, the monarchy. Today, they are closely linked politically.

An interesting dialectic can be observed here, and it, in turn, clarifies the question of what the “human-society-state” node is and how it finds its solution. As we have already noted, in Marxism and other similar teachings, it is known that, first of all, the individual-human being came into being at the end of a biosociogenetic transformation that lasted for billions of years. He, in turn, was the cause of the emergence of the family, the tribe, the village or the city, and finally the state. Here we are faced with the question of whether, even if primitive, an exhibition, a family, a rural town, an enlightened socialization can emerge without management. "Thus," argues Gegel, "the realization of a personal goal, which depends on the collective, ultimately leads to a system based on all-round dependence. After all, the daily life of a single individual, his well-being, his living on a legal basis, as mentioned above, is intertwined with the livelihood, well-being and rights of all, and only on this basis will it be truly and fully ensured. This system can be considered, figuratively speaking, as an "external state" based on the needs of some intellect. If it is permissible to analyze the above point, it should be said that any individual plan has a future only if the goal is consistent with the collective goal, and there is no other way. Individual aspirations, in turn, can be assessed in terms of what and how the common well-being is in harmony with the common, nation-wide development, common interests.

The way in which this common aspiration is realized depends on the capacity of the state. As we can see, another important element of "politics" has emerged at the heart of the individual - the collective - the state. The above sequence is as follows: first the individual, then the propensity for community in his mind, the state after a long time, and finally, the simple idea that this chain ends with "politics." On the contrary, apart from the person in the system, the remaining three elements, i.e., community, state, and politics, almost simultaneously, do not require one or the other to comment on one without the other. However, if there was no collective factor, there would be no need for the state. But only if the team is managed will it be real. Otherwise, the collective, which is the product of an ontological element, is nothing but a crowd. In it, people would be in groups, as in the animal kingdom, and would live in conditions conducive to their physical needs. Such a naturalness can only be eradicated by the state. The human-specific sociogenetic aspect becomes one of the types of culture through adaptation to the state. It literally turns a person into a flower of the mind. The pursuit of teamwork, which is a unique aspect of it, gains great strength on this basis.

As we can see, the collective is a great change in the human body in relation to chaos, in a sense a serious step from chaos to order (space). As one of beings, man differs drastically from others through sociality. But the inner force that drives it also needs composition and control. This means that the state takes over, and politics and political practice are the only necessary tools for the state. It, in turn, becomes a political tool only if it reflects the collective will, the aspiration. So it is impossible to imagine a state without politics. It will be a real state only if it mobilizes its forces for the whole society. If the state reflects the will of individuals, groups or individuals, it will not lose its "center" of power in any sense - but it will no longer be a state, but a terrible weapon that has completely forgotten its origin and purpose.

In the form of the human sociogenetic code, the propensity for community does not become a political process in itself. It needs to be managed, only the state can do it. Naturally, there must be enough power in the state for this to happen. When we talk about the "power", which is an integral immanent feature of the state, we mean that it is a unique social factor that serves the interests of society, security, stability, serving citizens, otherwise it has no significance for the people. If power is

necessary for politics, it must also serve the people, the citizens. As long as the space of man, community, state and politics is limited by the scope of time, power also has an enlightened limit, and as soon as power crosses the border, it forgets its politicality and becomes an anti-human force.

It is true that at a time when European thought is still predominant, the Eastern interpretation of the "Human-Society-Nature" harmony sometimes seems strange. Regardless of which source belongs to the East - whether Indian, Japanese, Mongol, Arab, or Iranian (which is especially evident in the Chinese way of thinking) - the practice of comparing them to a superficial, stylistic Western model is not out of circulation. This leads to some kind of mental dissatisfaction. The reason is that no matter how many peoples or nations there are in the world, each has a style of having a private opinion. This means that for science, it is not the stylistics of this or that thought that is important, but the meaning and essence hidden in it. The meaning of Lao Tzu's legacy is that the tendency from man to goodness, to universality, not to be weakened by any internal or external negative influence, otherwise man will find it difficult to perform his duty, so it is necessary to refrain from interfering and encourage him. This means that collective living, activity, and prosperity, although human inherent immanence, must be constantly nourished, encouraged, and managed by social forces. An "internal agreement" is already in place in the Eastern and Western scientific communities.

In conclusion, it can be said that the tendency to collectivism, which is an invariant sociogenetic invariant for the human race, is its clear priority in relation to the state. required statehood and the state as a form and source of politics. So, as much as the existence of the state is an axiom, its source is the collective axiom.

References:

1. Isaev I.A. Uchreditelnoe nasilie: mest i jertvoprinoshenie // Istoriya gosudarstva i prava. - 2018. - №3. - S. 5.
2. Gelvetsiy K. — A. O cheloveke // Sochineniya v 2-tomax. - M., 1974. - p. 93-94.
3. De Sharden P.T. The phenomenon of man. - M., 1987. - p. 135.
4. Gegel G.V. Otnoshenie filosofii k drugim oblastyam // Soch. T. 9. Lectures on the history of philosophy. - M., 1932. - p. 89.
5. Gegel G.V. Historical philosophy // Soch. T. 8. - S. 30-31.
6. Gelvetsiy K. — A. O cheloveke // Sochineniya v 2-tomax. - M., 1974. - p. 93-94.
7. Russo J. - J. Ontology of world philosophy. V 4-tomax. - M., 1970. - p. 566-567
8. Rossman V. Plato as a mirror, russkoy idei // Voprosy filosofii. - 2005. - № 4. - p. 46.
9. Moiseev N. Razmyshlenie o sovremennoy politologii. Political sciences:
10. Gegel G.V. Otnoshenie filosofii k drugim oblastyam // Soch. T. 9. Lectures on the history of philosophy. - M., 1922. - p. 212.
11. Gegel. Philosophy of law // Sochineniya. - M.—L., 1934. T. 7. - S. 212.