

## BASIC MODELS OF INTERACTION OF PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Valiev B.N.

Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor,  
Internathional Islamic Academy Of Izbekistan

### ANNOTATION

The article examines the interdisciplinary origins of sociological metatheory, its current state, relationship with subject sociological theories and with the philosophy of social sciences, as well as the prospects for the development of some fundamental theoretical issues related to sociological theories of action and theories of social norms.

**Keywords:** philosophical knowledge, social knowledge, socio-philosophical, hierarchical connection of social philosophy, philosophical reflection, philosophical disputes, social consciousness, philosophical classics, socially significant.

### INTRODUCTION

The topic indicated in the title of the article is being actively discussed today. Among Russian philosophers, some confusion is noticeable in the understanding of social philosophy. Most often it is interpreted as a disciplinarily separated area of philosophical knowledge, institutionalized in the structure of higher education and scientific institutions of a philosophical profile. As for its content, after the Istmatist monism, there is no unity in Soviet philosophy today. Moreover, many specialists easily switched in political terms to a new democratic worldview, but methodologically and epistemologically remained in the position of historical materialism. This problem of Russian philosophers - the difficulty of a theoretical reaction to new social processes - has not escaped Western scientists either in connection with the process of radical social transformations and the change of paradigms of social knowledge. We believe that the discussion of ways of connecting social philosophy with the sciences of society creates a context that allows us to identify both the relationship of the social sciences and the humanities with social philosophy, and the content of the latter, at least its cognitive functions.

### METHODS OF LITERATURE

In the XX century. the contradiction between the two research programs - naturalistic and culture-centrist - was one of the sources of the movement of methodological knowledge, as well as the sciences themselves. These programs should be recognized as the main ones in the methodology of social sciences and humanities. They are the backbone factors of social science, determining the vision of its specifics and its methods. At the same time, the culture-centrist research program is more diverse in terms of philosophical premises than the naturalistic one. Its manifestation is known as a unique program of the sciences of culture and history, coming from G. Rickert and V. Windelband, as a hermeneutic program. There is a phenomenological version of this program, closer to Plato's idealism. The maxim of phenomenology, according to Apel's definition, is that "being is not reducible to the existing", "the world" to "what happens inside the world", "meaning" or "essence" to "facts". Here there is a huge influence of E. Husserl's

phenomenology, which led to the spread of the phenomenological method in sociology by A. Schütz, P. Berger and T. Luckmann, its application in pedagogy, psychology and psychiatry. Phenomenology appears as an antithesis to naturalism, including in the form of psychologism. German philosophers K.-O. Apel and J. Habermas formulated a communicative research program, the origins of which lie with C. Pearce. In this program, a society infinitely open to communication, an unlimited and critical communicative community appears as a transcendental prerequisite for the social sciences and humanities. Yu Habermas and other philosophers highlight the project of modernity, which is considered incomplete, emphasize its normative significance, which makes the philosophical classics a methodological tool of social cognition.

## RESULTS

In the course of the discussions that took place, several models of interaction between philosophy and social sciences and humanities have developed today. Among them:

- the model of the hierarchical connection of social philosophy with the theoretical level of specific sciences about society, which is now rejected by the majority, a kind of pyramid, if we use geometric images, at the top of which is social philosophy as a methodological regulator for theories in specific sciences about society and man. " in the eyes of Russian colleagues is inextricably linked with the placement of historical materialism at the top of this pyramid. This is true, but the Marxist connotations are not the only possible interpretation. In the West, this pyramid is associated with the concept of R. Merton, who believed that there is an upper level of abstract, universal, generalizing and all-embracing theories (the level of social philosophy) and the theory of the middle level (theory of the middle rank of action) as the ultimate generalizations characteristic of specific disciplines studying society;
- the model of concentric circles, in which the inner circle characterizes everyday life as a basic basis, the second, external in relation to the first circle is the level of philosophical (socio-philosophical) knowledge and the circle following it is social and humanitarian scientific knowledge (V.E. Kemerov's model). The meaning of this approach is to emphasize the middle mediating function of philosophy in the relationship between everyday experience (I would add anti-reductionism, specialized practices) and specific social sciences and humanities;
- the model of the shift from the integration of sciences and philosophy to interdisciplinarity, increasing the importance of philosophy in opening new contexts and creating a broader panorama of knowledge. In relation to the previous model, the circles partially intersect with each other. Not only philosophy gives impetus to specific sciences, but social sciences and humanities influence philosophy and give impetus to its development (the model of I. T. Kasavin). A similar idea is developed by I. Wallerstein, in whose opinion the defining trend is interdisciplinarity, because the separation and separation of social spheres and the corresponding sciences - economics, politics, sociology - is a hopelessly outdated product of liberal ideology;
- the model of a kind of "rotation" of a triangle (pyramid from the first model), in which the place of philosophy is taken by sociology, other disciplines and, finally, this triangle describes a full circle and returns social philosophy to its former place at the apex of the triangle (pyramid)

(model H . M. Smirnova). I would call this a model for the change of leading disciplines, but usually this is attributed to specific social sciences and humanities, among which clear leadership is now given to the sciences of culture.

From my point of view, the applicability of the designated models depends on what sciences we are talking about, with what type of philosophical reflection they are associated. For example, the second model fits the phenomenological and hermeneutic paradigms in the social sciences and humanities, but has little to do with positivist approaches that remain strong in the social sciences. We need more general characteristics of the influence of philosophy on the social and human sciences, which can be given by the concept of a research program. This task was formulated by G. Rickert when he wrote that "one can make an attempt to understand the world whole, proceeding from the object, that is, to achieve unity by involving the subject in the world of objects, or, conversely, based on the subject, one can search for objects in the all-embracing world subject. This is how two opposing worldviews arise and most of the philosophical disputes and problems that constantly arise again could, to a certain extent, be reduced to the contradiction of objectivism and subjectivism understood in this way as the last basis of the dispute. " This "final ground for controversy" is also embedded in the models mentioned above. Therefore, it makes sense to consider the interaction of social sciences and humanities and social philosophy, taking into account these foundations.

## DISCUSSION

The essential conclusion that we come to as a result of this analysis is that social philosophy can be considered not only and not so much as a disciplinary fragment of philosophical knowledge. Philosophy is entirely social. Ethics, aesthetics, the theory of knowledge and other areas of philosophical analysis are deeply socially conditioned and socially significant, heuristic and integrated with the social sciences and humanities. Social philosophy demonstrates the intention to comprehend and engage in social practice, shows that in today's social context there is a competition of explanations, in which the philosophical classics also participate. Thus, the XXI World Philosophical Congress (Istanbul, 2003) "Philosophy in the face of world (global) problems" was marked by the application of the concepts of T. Hobbes, J. Locke, I. Kant, J. Habermas, J. Rawls, K. Schmitt to explanation of terrorism, wars, sovereignty, world order, world inequality, etc. Therefore, I can not agree with V. Ye. Kemerov that general philosophy today has only a cultural, pedagogical and bureaucratic function. "General" philosophy is social philosophy. As for the disciplined social philosophy, I share the definition of K. S. Pigrov, in whose opinion social philosophy has as its goal the comprehension of the universal through the study of society. The philosophical meaning of society is found in the fact that it reveals the universal to the individual. I agree (unlike those who are focused on purely scholastic theorizing) that social philosophy builds a conceptual system for studying society, establishes a connection between concepts and their theories with pragmatics. At the same time, the development of concepts for still non-existent contexts, participation in the creation of mental projects, is perhaps the most practical task of philosophy. I do not consider social philosophy to be a science, but I recognize for it the status of an independent form of social consciousness of philosophy. And finally, the pragmatic function of philosophy is that it creates paths for expert knowledge

that integrates a variety of social, humanitarian, philosophical approaches, everyday life and specialized knowledge.

### REFERENCE

- 1) African, American and European Trajectories of Modernity: Past Oppression, Future Justice?
- 2) (2015) Ed. by P. Wagner. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press. 312 p.
- 3) Ferrarotti, F. (2014) On the Strained Relationship between Philosophy and Sociology //
- 4) Academicus International Scientific Journal. №7. P. 14–19.
- 5) Buenos Aires, 2005.
- 6) Habermas J. Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns. Bd. 1: Handlungsrationalität
- 7) und gesellschaftliche Rationalisierung. Frankfurt am Mein, 1997.
- 8) Habermas J. Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns. Bd 2: Zur Kritik der
- 9) funktionalischen Vernunft. Frankfurt am Mein, 1997.
- 10) Hollis M. The philosophy of the social sciences. Cambridge, 1994.
- 11) Hollis M. Philosophy of social science // The Blackwell companion to philosophy
- 12) Narveson, J. (1999) Social Philosophy // The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy. 2 ed. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. P. 856–858.
- 13) Overstreet, H. A. (1914) The Function and Scope of Social Philosophy // The Journal of Philosophy
- 14) Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods. Vol. 11. №20. P. 533–543.
- 15) Vatin, F. (2017) De la philosophie sociale à la sociologie: science, normativité et politique //
- 16) L'Année sociologique. Vol. 67 (2). P. 295–312.
- 17) Wagner, P. (2012) Modernity. Understanding the Present. Cambridge : Polity Press. 206 p.
- 18) Smith D. The rise of historical sociology. Philadelphia, 1991.
- 19) Touraine A. Critique de la modernité. P., 1998.