

PHILOSOPHY AS A UNITY OF SCIENTIFIC AND EXTRA-SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE

Abstract: *This article analyzes philosophy as a unit of scientific and unscientific knowledge.*

Key words: *Philosophy, scientific knowledge, unscientific knowledge, worldview*

ФИЛОСОФИЯ КАК ЕДИНСТВО НАУЧНОГО И ВНЕНАУЧНОГО ПОЗНАНИЯ

Аннотация: В данной статье философия анализируется как единица научного и ненаучного знания.

Ключевые слова: Философия, научное знание, ненаучное знание, мировоззрение

The modern era, in contrast to the medieval consciousness and way of life, proclaims science as the highest and, in essence, the only true form of knowledge. Science is interpreted not only as a standard of genuine knowledge, but also as knowledge of the divine. The Middle Ages considered only faith capable of knowing the absolute, of superintelligent (but not unreasonable, according to Thomas Aquinas) knowledge. The antifeudal philosophy of modern times puts science in place of faith. The matter is moving towards the deification of science, and this process finds its most vivid expression in Hegel, who asserts: "The absolute idea is the content of science."

It would be wrong to believe that the classics of philosophy overestimated all the sciences of their time. Mathematics was undoubtedly highly appreciated by them, while the empirical sciences did not enjoy much of their recognition. "Science in the proper sense," wrote, for example, Kant, "can only be called a

science whose reliability is apodictical; knowledge that can have only empirical reliability is knowledge only in an improper sense."

Our understanding of the attitude of the classics of philosophy to science would be incomplete, insufficient, if we did not fully take into account their ideas about the relationship between philosophy and sciences. The classics strove to turn philosophy into a science, into a rigorous science. They criticized previous philosophy as inconsistent with the standard of scientificity. And at the same time, they argued that philosophy, since it becomes a science, is a science of sciences, i.e. higher science, thereby opposing philosophy to sciences. It is very significant that, according to Hegel's teachings, the highest form of the absolute spirit, i.e. absolute knowledge is not science, but philosophy. In such a formulation of the question, there is no underestimation of science or scientific character. We are talking about something else: philosophically meaningful, interpreted sciences are included in philosophy, which, thus, is declared the only adequate form of scientific knowledge.

So, on the one hand, already at the dawn of modern times, science is proclaimed the standard of all knowledge, and philosophy is criticized for lack or even lack of scientific character. But, on the other hand, those philosophical systems that are declared scientific are opposed to sciences as the highest scientific knowledge. It should be noted that the sciences are also opposed to those philosophical doctrines that do not pretend to be scientific, but consider sciences as the lowest forms of knowledge. Such are, for example, religious and philosophical teachings. Consequently, the high assessment of science, scientific character, so characteristic of the modern era, did not exclude the opposition of philosophy to sciences. This opposition was already present in the very understanding of philosophy as a science of sciences.

In the twentieth century, the relationship between philosophy and sciences is changing significantly. Despite the tremendous achievements of the sciences and the scientific and technological progress associated with them, a critical

assessment of science arises and develops. Such an assessment appears in the sciences themselves as an expression of their methodological crisis. However, the main role in the critical understanding of the sciences is played, of course, by philosophy. Her critical position is directly related to the fact that, on the one hand, she is a member of the scientific community, and on the other, she is more or less an extra-scientific phenomenon.

Here the question arises: in what sense is the concept of science applicable to philosophy? Given the highly significant differences between the sciences (for example, between mathematics and historiography), we may also ask: what is science in general? Formally, science can be defined as some kind of institutionalized teaching that is studied in educational institutions. Students attend lectures, participate in seminars, pass exams, and receive appropriate grades. Lectures are given by professors, associate professors conduct seminars, academic councils award academic degrees.

The institutional definition of science is essential for its existence in society. But it is completely insufficient for understanding the cognitive significance of science. It is necessary, therefore, to determine what distinguishes scientific from non-scientific knowledge. From my point of view, science can be defined as systematic, specialized research, limited to a certain area, research that applies concepts, evidence, special methods of achieving and verifying its results.

Philosophy can be viewed as a science not only from an institutional, but also from a cognitive point of view. Like any science, it is a systematic, specialized research that limits its field, operating with concepts, evidence, experimental data, as well as methods of checking its own results. Scientific is not only Spinoza's attempt to prove geometrically the foundations of his system, but Hegel's attempt is also scientific, proceeding from the concept of pure being, devoid of any definitions, to deduce a system of categories covering all reality.

Of course, we can disagree with the conclusions of Spinoza and Hegel. We can judge their systems as faulty. But these assessments, although they relate not only to the content, but also to the methods of these teachings, do not refute the fact that philosophy as a form of systematic specialized research, regardless of whether its content is scientific, is a science (*science sui generis*). It would be a gross mistake to belittle, underestimate the form of scientificity inherent in philosophy on the grounds that it does not guarantee scientific content. As you know, the laws of logic also do not guarantee the truth of logically correct statements, but if statements contradict logic, they are unscientific. Philosophy conforms to logic and therefore its form is scientific, regardless of its content.

References:

1. Исмаилова З. К. и др. Адаптация молодых специалистов как составляющая деятельности руководителя образовательной организации //International conference on scientific development in North America. – 2017. – С. 16-20.
2. Болтаева М. Л. и др. Воспитание учащихся профессиональных колледжей на основе усвоения национальных культурных ценностей //Молодой ученый. – 2016. – №. 12. – С. 832-833.
3. Тургунов С. Т., Ахмаджонова Н. М. Особенности управления дошкольными образовательными учреждениями //Вопросы гуманитарных наук. – 2012. – №. 2. – С. 80-82.
4. Тургунов С. Т. СТРАТЕГИИ И СТРАТЕГИЧЕСКОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ–ОСНОВА ЭФФЕКТИВНОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫХ УЧРЕЖДЕНИЙ //ЯЗЫК И АК. – 2016. – С. 48.
5. Narzulloevna, Allayarova Solikha, et al. "MODERN PEDAGOGICAL METHODS IN EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION OF LESSONS." *Journal of Critical Reviews* 7.9 (2020): 129-133.
6. Allayarova S. N. Implementation of Modern Information Communication Technologies (ICT) in Higher Education Sector: International Experience and The Example of Uzbekistan //International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering. – 2019. – Т. 9. – №. 1. – С. 386-392.

7. Narzulloevna A. S. et al. MODERN PEDAGOGICAL METHODS IN EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION OF LESSONS //Journal of Critical Reviews. – 2020. – Т. 7. – №. 9. – С. 129-133.
8. Abdullaeva, N. B. (2015). THE ESSENCE AND CONTENT OF THE AESTHETIC COMPONENT IN DESIGN. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 9(29), 169-171.
9. Абдуллаева, Б. (2014). Диалектическое видение эстетического компонента в дизайне. Credo new, (3), 14-14.
10. Абдуллаева, Н. Б. Дизайн как фактор формирования культурного пространства. Фалсафа ва ҳуқуқ, 2/4/2017, 70-72.
11. Tuyboevna, K. S. (2020). Interactive method – one of the most popular types of today's pedagogical technologies. European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences, 8 (11), Part II, 83-92.
12. Karimova Sanobar Tuyboevna. (2020). Using the educational electronic resource phet in the teaching of physics. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. 10 (6). 1424-1426.
13. Karimova Sanobar Tuyboevna. (2021). About the use of interactive method and phet electronic resource in educational process. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 8. <https://doi.org/10.47494/mesb.2021.2.164>