

**THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES TO THE
THEMATIC AND NATURAL SCIENCES**

Abstract: This article discusses the relationship between the social sciences and the natural sciences.

Key words: scientific knowledge, science, social science, natural science, development

**ОТНОШЕНИЕ ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫХ НАУК С ТЕМАТИЧЕСКИМИ И
ЕСТЕСТВЕННЫМИ НАУКАМИ**

Аннотация: В статье обсуждается взаимосвязь между общественными и естественными науками.

Ключевые слова: научное знание, наука, обществознание, естествознание, развитие.

Attribution to the social sciences can vary depending on the difference between tasks (fundamental, utilitarian-applied) and, in part, objects (areas covered by the knowledge of mankind in the course of the general civilization process, on the one hand, and disciplines in the educational and academic understanding, on the other).

The methodology and principles underlying a particular utilitarian classification may differ for reasons: state-specific, religious-cult, historical (opportunistic), subjective-authorial, etc. their intercomparison should bear in mind the inevitable influence of the utilitarian and highly specific tasks of the “customer” or “consumer” of a particular classification.

Remaining true in the context of the conditions of its appearance and the tasks facing it, none of the variants of the utilitarian classification can pretend to be absolutely objective. Pairwise comparison of options can be useful, for

example, in terms of improving a particular national-state classification system. However, outside of this goal-setting, the disputes “which classification is more correct” are most often unscientific and scholastic. Attempts to oppose any of the utilitarian classifications - fundamentally epistemological - cannot lead to a positive result: the latter is formulated at a qualitatively different philosophical level, which presupposes an abstraction not only from national-cultural, but also from, in a sense, historical the entire history of cognition, from the undivided philosophy of antiquity to the deeply differentiated system of modern sciences). The most striking example of the collision of the fundamental and utilitarian approaches is the definition of the place of philosophy in the system of scientific knowledge.

As can be seen from the register below, in the utilitarian classification, philosophy on the basis of the subject is placed in the category of social sciences, along with other sciences “about society”. However, when solving the issue of classification of sciences in its fundamental formulation, science of science distinguishes between two principles: objective (when the connection of sciences is derived from the connection of the objects of research themselves), and subjective, when the characteristics of the subject are put in the basis of the classification of sciences.

The question of the relationship between philosophy and the private sciences is a kind of core of the entire history of the classification of sciences. In this history, there are three main stages, corresponding to: 1) undivided philosophical science of antiquity (and partly of the Middle Ages); 2) differentiation of sciences in the XV-XVIII centuries. (analytical division of knowledge into separate branches); 3) reintegration (synthetic recreation, linking sciences into a single system of knowledge), noted since the 19th century. In accordance with these stages, the search for the very principles of the classification of science is being conducted.

Taking, as an example, the so-called. an encyclopedic series compiled by Saint-Simon and developed by Comte (here sciences are classified according to the transition from simpler and general phenomena to more complex and particular ones, with the mechanics of earthly bodies included in mathematics, psychology in physiology, and sociology Comte is one of the creators of this science - assigns a special place):

“Encyclopedic Series” of Sciences of Saint-Simon-Comte

mathematics → astronomy → physics → chemistry → physiology → sociology
we see that philosophy, on the one hand, is, as it were, absorbed by sociology, but on the other hand, it is present in mathematics in the form of logic. Subsequently, as the reintegration of scientific knowledge (and the realization of its necessity came in the XX century due to the emergence of a multitude of sciences at the junction of previously differentiated categories) of scientific knowledge, the loop dialectically closed, and science science came to the need to single out philosophy - not so much as “historically first”, as a backbone, in a separate category.

This principle was adhered to by the Soviet science of science. The table below is one of the variants of the linear form of representation of the hierarchy of sciences (it corresponds to a complex two-dimensional diagram, where many connecting lines not reflected here are drawn, demonstrating the relationship between the sciences).

The collision lies in the fact that, recognizing philosophy as a special place in the entire system of scientific knowledge within the framework of the fundamental classification, during the transition to utilitarian schemes, Soviet scholars of science - like modern systematizers - were forced to place philosophy in one systemic group with political economy, scientific communism, and etc. In the curricula, the organizational structure of universities, this group figured under the name of the departments of social sciences (KON; in technical schools and vocational schools - commissions on

social sciences). This, we repeat, is not a contradiction, but a functional difference due to utilitarian necessity; both approaches - both fundamental and utilitarian - have an equal right to exist in the context of the tasks they are aimed at solving.

Commentary: the term “Social Sciences” was used in the original source as a synonym for “social sciences” (partly because of the need to formally avoid this collision). The descriptive term “Baseline and Superstructure Sciences” roughly corresponds to modern political science. The didactic-illustrative task was the main one when compiling the table, and therefore the general list of the sciences indicated in it does not claim to be exhaustive. At the same time, some of the names corresponding to well-known independent sciences are used as collective ones, under which whole groups of “sub-branches” are assumed - for example, astronautics.

Antagonistic, that is, irreconcilably contradictory (see. Laws of Philosophy) collisions in the classification of certain sciences (including social sciences) lead to the scrupulous problematic of the relationship between the concepts of “science” and “pseudoscience.” Some examples of such antagonism are generated by fundamental differences between the basic forms of the worldview: idealistic and materialistic. Taking a detached position, it is impossible to give a positive answer to the question whether some of the disciplines studied in religious educational institutions belong to the category of social sciences? Is the discipline “Scientific Communism” included in the diplomas of tens of millions of Soviet specialists with higher education as a social science? Based on the principle of respect for everyone's personal right to their own worldview, protected by the rules of Wikipedia, here these (and similar) aggressive oppositions on ideological and worldview grounds should be recognized as inappropriate. Leaving for everyone the choice of the “correct” answer - in the literature of the corresponding ideological direction, where this

answer is properly substantiated in the system of those categories of the world outlook, which operates this or that current of social thought.

The above collisions should be distinguished from attempts to supplement the “official” list of social sciences with categories designed for purely commercial purposes of deriving income from the sale of knowledge from a supposedly “new” field of science. Without giving specific names, here you can recommend an effective litmus indicator that allows you to distinguish true science from pseudoscience: to study the list (and origin) of publications displayed by search engines when entering a controversial name in English or another common foreign language.

References:

1. Uroкова O. J. CHULPON'S CREATIVE WORK IN THE LEGACY OF THE AESTHETICAL THOUGHT OF MANKIND //Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2016. – №. 9. – С. 183-188.
2. Uroкова O. Urakova Oysuluv Jamoliddinovna THE PRAISE OF NATURE AND THE UNIVERSE IN NOVALIS ROMANCE //Архив исследований. – 2020.
3. Uroкова O. Urakova O. Zh. PhD PHILOSOPHICAL AND ARTISTIC AND AESTHETIC ESSENCE OF CHULPAN'S EDUCATIONAL IDEAS //Архив исследований. – 2020.
4. Ўроқова О. Ж. Чўлпон ижодининг бадиий-эстетик моҳияти.« //Илм зиё заковат»-Тошкент. – 2019.
5. Mamurova F., Yuldashev J. METHODS OF FORMING STUDENTS'INTELLECTUAL CAPACITY //Экономика и социум. – 2020. – №. 4. – С. 66-68.
6. Турсункулова Ш. Т. ЗДОРОВЬЕ МАТЕРИ И РЕБЁНКА КАК ОСНОВА СТАБИЛЬНОСТИ ОБЩЕСТВА //ФИЛОСОФИЯ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ МИРЕ. – 2017. – С. 194-197.
7. Tursunkulova S. T. PHILOSOPHICAL PROBLEMS OF WOMEN'S SOCIAL ACTIVITY TODAY //Научно-методический и теоретический журнал. – 2014. – С. 35.