

THE MORAL OF THE NATIONAL MENTALITY LIES IN ITS IMPORTANCE IN THE NATIONAL IDEOLOGY

Allayarov Xalmurat Jaqsimuratovich

Teacher, Nukus State Pedagogical Institute named after Ajiniyaz

+998972201106, xalmurat_72@inbox.ru

ABSTRACT

The article presents the concept of the structural connection of the specifics of the phenomena of mentality and mentality in the framework of the development of sociospatial identity. The single root of the development of mentality and mentality as socio-cultural phenomena is revealed, functioning in various degrees of social organization, the essence of which is the need for identification as a description of the property of sociality. The socio-philosophical study of mental constructs made it possible to discover the one and the special in the process of functioning of mentality and mentality. The substantiation of their structures is given, as well as the interdependence between the structural features and characteristics of the constancy/dynamism of the mentality, as well as the mentality and significance in the development of the components of sociospatial identity: national and social identities.

Keywords: socio-spatial identity, national identity, social identity, mentality, national ideology, mentalite.

INTRODUCTION

Mental constructs specific to each society are one of the most important characteristics of the socio-cultural space. This was due to the scientific interest in the problem of the mental phenomenon, which was developed in the formation of a number of directions in the study of this problem, since the XX century. The tradition of the study of mental constructs has its origins in Western socio-philosophical thought. Within its framework, firstly, the practice of methodological multivariability in the interpretation of the mental phenomenon is emerging through the use of the following concepts: "collective mentalities" (L. Levi-Bruhl, E. Cassirer, M. Blok, L. Fevre), "social character" (E. Fromm), "mentality" (J. Le Groff, G. Duby, A. Dupron, F. Grouse, F. Aries, P. Burke, A. Buro, etc.); secondly, the mental phenomenon is considered as psychological, historical, and later as social. The socio-philosophical tradition of studying the specifics of the Russian mentality was founded in the XIX century. a galaxy of Russian scientists, including: N.Y. Danilevsky, V.S. Solovyov, V.V. Rozanov, N.A. Berdyaev, S.L. Frank, B.P. Vysheslavtsev, L.N. Gumilev, I.A. Ilyin, N.O. Lossky, K.G. Manstein, O.A. Platonov, I.A. Solzhenitsyn.

In a later period, mentality as a socio-philosophical phenomenon is considered in the works of E.I. Anufrieva, L.V. Lesnoy, F.T. Outleeva, Yu.V. Kolesnichenko, G.G. Diligensky, etc.; the problem of uncertainty of the terminological relationship of mentality and mentality is revealed, to which the works of G.N. Drepa, A.N. Dmitriev, E.Y. Dmitrieva, E.Y. Zubkova, A.I. Kupriyanov, T.V. Ivanova, etc. are devoted.

METHODS

In modern Western European and Russian humanities, there is no unified approach to the definition of mentality and mentality and their structure, which requires further theoretical understanding of the mental phenomenon.

There is no doubt that mentality is a system that has its own specific structure. The analysis of a number of approaches to determining the structure of mentality leads to the identification of some contradictions in views and the discovery of their limited structural composition, as well as insufficient theoretical elaboration of structural relationships between components and levels of mentality. It should be noted that there is no necessary unity of opinion on these issues, which actualizes their further development.

Based on the analysis of a number of concepts of mentality and mentality, it seems possible to position them as interrelated, but far from identical concepts and entities. Mentality and mentality are formed at different levels of social organization, while having a similar two-level structure. The mentality is formed and developed at the macro-social level. Its subjects are an ethnos, a people, a nation. The mentality is explicated at the mesosocial and microsocial levels, in the activities of social groups and individuals.

To substantiate our point of view, it is appropriate to ask the question: what is the source and cause of the formation of mentality and mentality? Due to the inherent sociality of a person, i.e. the need for participation, belonging to some kind of social community, an identity is formed in him. As the modern researcher P. Smirnov notes, a certain measure of group homogeneity, or identity, is formed.

Group identity is formed in the process of socialization, acculturation, etc. The definition of the term "identity" has been developed by a number of sciences, in particular psychology, social psychology, ethnosociology. However, there is no generally accepted interpretation of this phenomenon. In this regard, it is advisable to turn to the origins of its study. For the first time this question was raised in the works of the American psychologist E. Erickson. Then P. Berger considered the term "identity", identifying it with such concepts as "self-description", "self-image".

Society today has moved to the post-industrial level of development. This has formed a new type of philistine, which is more focused not on production, but on consumption. Post-industrial society creates artificial needs and skillfully introduces them into the mass consciousness with the ultimate goal of making a profit. This process is not limited to biological needs, it also affects social needs.

At the same time, social needs largely depend on socio-cultural and deep psychological attitudes, which together, according to the concept of Professor N.S. Rozov, represent ideological attitudes. The definition of social relations in philosophy is used in the context of the designation of subjective orientations of an individual, as a member of a group, to certain values that prescribe certain socially accepted ways of behavior to individuals. The object of an installation or system of installations can potentially be not only an individual, but also a social group, nation, society. What explains the presence of this component in the structure of mentality and mentality? Attitudes tend to change under the influence of internal and external factors-determinants.

And here the problem of mentality is organically connected with the problem of values. The social needs of the subjects generate a system of values at the micro- and macro-social levels. The necessary satisfaction of a need presupposes the existence of an object through which it will be realized. They are of interest to an individual or society. In this regard, ideal or material objects existing in social reality can potentially act as values. Thus, to a certain extent in modern society, social and material needs are determined by socio-cultural attitudes.

And as a result of their presence, values are formed that exist at the micro- and macro-social levels.

The main function of values is to integrate people with similar life orientations and values into a single system. Consequently, the concept of value is a certain characteristic of the subject itself, since values always exist for subjects as carriers of certain types of activity, which means that they are relative, i.e. they are not such at all, but always only in relation to any subject. In the structure of the mentality there are national values, the subject of which is the people. We consider values as a structural component of the mentality, which is a supra-individual system of values inherent in the whole society, the people.

Values existing in the modern world, according to the basic classification, are divided into terminal and instrumental. M. Rokich supported this classification. By his definition, instrumental values are concepts of a desired mode of behavior, and terminal values are an expected state of existence. Terminal values are abstract representations of what is most desirable for a person, and instrumental values are considered as the most desirable ways of action. In addition, there are basic values in every society. They can be both finite and instrumental. The criterion of basic value is an indication of a final and logically non-deducible preference from others. Family values are the main ultimate values. Representatives of Russian philosophical and sociological schools considered values as phenomena or their separate aspects of nature and society, which are useful and necessary for people of a certain historical epoch or belonging to a certain class as a goal or ideal.

The objective moment of the value relationship is always present, because a person always evaluates something, an object with certain qualities. The subjective moment of the value relationship is mediated by the personal characteristics of the evaluating subject, which also affect the assessment. For example, values are determined by the historical epoch, the position of an individual and a social group in the economic, political and cultural systems of society. A number of regularities of the process of changing the value system in society were identified by K. Mannheim and P.A. Sorokin. They formulated a conclusion about the constant nature of the process of value formation, but in modern society such a conclusion has some peculiarities. K. Mannheim has an idea that with the complexity of the organization of society and its social and communicative system, a transition to more complex values is carried out in parallel. As a result, values are transformed from a just creative principle into a system of exploitation and imposition of social will. Another feature of modern society is the conscious nature of the formation and adoption of new values, while in traditional societies the value structure was formed to a greater extent on an irrational traditional-cultural basis.

Depending on the type of identification, a person can perceive both national values and values inherent in a certain social group. At the same time, the presence of a common social value system does not contradict the system of individual values that are formed within the

framework of an individual's living space. In the context of our research, values act as a kind of universal component that is part of the structure of both directions of identity.

The totality of attitudes, values and value orientations determines the direction of an individual's social activity, which is based on goal-setting and achieving goals. The theoretical understanding of the social orientation of activity is presented by R. Merton in his concept of types of social adaptation, according to which the social orientation of activity includes behavioral stereotypes and social subjectivity.

A person's need for self-identification is expressed at the macro- and microsocial levels, which leads to national identity and social identity, respectively expressed in mentality and mentality. Since we refer the concept of "mentality" to the whole people, the nation that is its bearer (subject), then, given the presence of social differentiation in society, an additional category is needed that can reflect the socio-psychological composition of a certain social stratum, caste, social group and other communities that make up society and are part of the nation.

But at the same time, social differences are manifested, fixed in their ideological positions, values, behavioral stereotypes, etc.

Based on the study of society from a systemic point of view, we come to the conclusion that modern society is organized into a complex spatial and hierarchical structure. The main element of the system is a person, and the initial elementary system of society is a social group. In this regard, it is quite appropriate to introduce the concept of "mentality" and distinguish its two main types in relation to modern society: individual and sociogroup. The individual mentality is rooted in the memory of the genus and is complemented by social conditions. We classify sociogroup mentality according to the criterion of functionality of a social group as a subject of mentality. In accordance with the specified basis of classification, we can distinguish three types of social groups, each of which has a mental specificity and features of the process of its formation and manifestation:

- 1) Sociogenetic group;
- 2) Socio-professional group;
- 3) Multifunctional interest groups.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Thus, the ratio of mentality and mentality appears to us not just as a ratio of a whole and a part, but as a ratio of two directions having a common root - sociospatial identity, similarities and differences between which we will consider further.

Mentality undergoes changes to a greater extent as a result of the influence of new socio-economic, political and cultural conditions of life on its subject, it is a more mobile component of socio-spatial identity in contrast to mentality. At the same time, without denying the relationship between mentality and mentality, it should be clarified that mentality is thought of as the result of identification at the microsocial level. As for individual attitudes, this process is associated with the process of socialization, which lasts throughout a person's life mainly because his living conditions are constantly changing. A person accepts new social roles, builds new social contacts, while receiving new information.

At the same time, there is a mechanism for selecting information for its partial internalization. As a result, the formation of attitudes is regulated not only by society, but also by the person

himself. The system of attitudes determines the social orientation of the individual, underlies its social activity.

The system of individual/group values as a structural component of the mentality has one important structural characteristic, which is the scaling of individual values when they are arranged in order of priority.

Thus, the most significant values are designated as value orientations. They are implemented exclusively at the microsocial level, can be inherent in both an individual and a social group. Because of this, they are included in the structure exclusively of the mentality.

Due to the social mosaic of modern Russian society, completely different mentalities are formed in it, the subjects of which are representatives of various social groups or strata. An important circumstance is the fact that along with the economic and spiritual crises, Russian society is currently experiencing an identity crisis, which is associated with the instability of socio-economic indicators of development. The consequence of this is the transformation of mentality, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the strengthening of the second direction of sociospatial identity - the sociogroup mentality. Social identity is an equally important type of identity and is often more in demand by an individual, especially in the context of the social culture of individualism.

The mentality reflecting national socio-psychological characteristics and the mentality, the essence of which is the specificity of the socio-cultural and behavioral appearance of a certain social group, can exist autonomously. The mentality is characterized by a dualistic character, since it contains a traditional basis and innovations. The "tradition - innovation" dichotomy underlying the mentality reflects the ability of the mentality to preserve the accumulated socio-cultural experience, supporting its transmission from generation to generation. This makes it possible both to freely update social relations and to develop social progress in general.

And now, having considered the structure of mentality and mentality, it seems necessary to highlight along with their common structural characteristics and distinctive features.

Since mentality develops and exists as a result of sociogroup identification, it tends to function at the level of individual and group consciousness. Mentality cannot be represented as the sum of mentalities. The presence of certain mentalities in society in a certain historical period is due to the social structure of this society, the presence of social differentiation according to a number of criteria. A social stratum or a social community as such may be present in the same society throughout the history of its development, while their mentality is marked by social time. The most striking example of this is the youth.

If we compare the mentality of Soviet youth, whose youth coincided with the years of the Great Patriotic War, and modern youth, we are unlikely to find common significant mental characteristics, ranging from attitudes to behavioral stereotypes. Demographic and morphological features are largely transmitted, and social time leaves its imprint on the spiritual, moral and external appearance of the subject of the sociogroup mentality.

Society is polymental. But exceeding the threshold level of diversity of mentalities within one society leads to an increase in the level of social tension and conflictogenicity. At the same time, the coexistence of different mentalities can also occur in a tolerant dialogue mode, the result of which can potentially be certain innovations. Against the background of a static mentality, the process of forming mentalities with higher rates of dynamics is observed.

CONCLUSION

Thus, having identified the relationship between the structure of mentality and mentality, we came to the conclusion about the functioning of mentality and mentality at different social levels. At the same time, it should be emphasized that in different periods of social time, one of the two directions of sociospatial identity becomes alternately dominant.

In periods of stable functioning of society, national identity, formed in favorable conditions of state development, is dominant. During periods of destabilization of the social system associated with interstate and interethnic conflicts, a crisis of national identity arises. It is during such periods that social identity becomes dominant. Mentality is more susceptible to transformation, which is explained by its conditionality of socio-economic, political and other conditions of formation characteristic of a certain period of social time. Mentality has greater resistance to external influences, especially it characterizes the deep level of mentality, which does not cancel the impact of the social environment on its external structural level. Thus, the structural specificity of mentality and mentality determines their transformation, reflecting the results of the development of society, on the one hand, and on the other – determining the vector of its further dynamics.

REFERENCES

1. Berger P., Lukman T. Socialnoe konstuirovaniye realnosti. - M.: Medium, 1995. - 323 p.
2. Dumnova E.M. Mentalitet i mentalnost v sociokulturnom prostranstve bitiya rossiyskoy molodeji. - Novosibirsk, 2013. - 288 p.
3. Merton R. Socialnaya struktura i anomiya// Sociologiya prestupnosti; trans. with French E.A. Samarskaya, edited by M.N. Gretskey. - M.: Progress, 1966. - pp. 299-313.
4. Polezhaev D.V. Ideya mentaliteta v russkoy filosofii "zolotogo veka". - Volgograd: Volga Publishing House, 2003 - 360 p.
5. Rokeach M. The nature of human values. – N.Y., 1973.