

ETNOCULTURE AS A RESEARCH OBJECT OF PHILOSOPHICAL AND ETHNOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Alimasov Viktor Aleksandrovich

Doctor of Philosophy, Professor of Uz DSMI

viktoralimasovuzdsmi (@)mail.ru

Abstract:

In this article investigated philosophical and ethnological interpryes "etnoculture" and his please in the sostial-historical prossersies, shape of life, traditions and integration prossersies by people mass.

Introduction

The study of the philosophical and ethnological issues of ethnoculture is necessary not only to determine the history of the nation, but also to determine its place in social development and its tasks as an actor of universal human processes. In today's era of globalization, preserving ethnocultures and ensuring their development in accordance with their inherent characteristics has become an urgent problem.

The diversity of cultures is a guarantee for pluralistic and democratic development.

Goals and tasks: 1) Analysis of scientific interpretations of ethnoculture from a philosophical and ethnological point of view; 2) to reveal the intrinsic features of ethnoculture in the case of the Uzbek people; 3) to identify the modern problems facing Uzbek ethnoculture; 5) Based on the study of the integration possibilities of ethnoculture, projective justification of its contribution to universal global development, development of specific proposals and recommendations in this regard.

Research Methodology. The article uses the complex and systematic functional approach of philosophy, the sociodynamic observation of social events as well as retrospective and perspective analysis methods of sociology. Methods of content analysis and expert opinion research were also used.

Scientific Reviews. The history of peoples is the history of their ethnocultures. The study of the history of ethnocultures is also the study of the history of peoples and thus their future. F. Nietzsche says: "We are chained to history, no matter where we run, the chain of history runs with us [1, p.159]. At the same time, he shows that history is necessary for moving (monumental), preserving and venerating (antique) and freedom-seeking (critical) individuals, that is, to be "for life" [1, 168- b.]. To be active - within the framework of history, in one's own nature, honoring the heritage of ancestors - is the basis of heritage, and freedom is the core of human biosocial existence. F. summarizes it metaphysically: Nietzsche says: "History is vital." The need for life is broader than man's epistemological interest in knowing history; it corresponds to the goal of shaping the future. Where this goal is forgotten, the essence of history and ethnoculture is also forgotten. "For Life" stands for the future and the purpose of creation. "Ethnoculture" is a category made up of the combination of the words ethnos and culture. Folk culture is its



etymological meaning and is also used in this sense in scientific literature. [2;3;4] Couldn't culture belong to the people? NO. Or could people not create culture? NO. "No" to both questions is a categorical imperative.

Therefore, culture belongs to the people, and the people and people are the only creators and subjects of culture. If not, why is culture divided into two parts - popular culture, mass culture and nobility, elite culture?

The theory of nobles and elites has existed since the time of Plato, with its modern conceptual questions G. Mosca, V. Pareto, Jose Ortega i-Gasset and E. Canneti were involved. According to elite theory, unique and one-of-a-kind cultural assets are created by a few, highly talented individuals. In this way, the theory of the elite leads to the idea that popular culture is created by the masses, the mediocre people. Culture, especially art, requires high professionalism, that's an axiom. However, while Stradivari's violin was created by a skilled craftsman, the drum that can be played by anyone was created by the masses, by none other than him. The drum, like the violin, is a high-pitched instrument. So the division of culture into elite and mass culture raises many questions. It is necessary to separately study this topic of theoretical importance. And we deal with ethnocultural realities.

The next interpretation of ethnoculture refers to national culture. According to Wikipedia, ethnoculture is a closed system that does not accept other cultures and their elements. The national culture is open to the influence of other cultures[5]. If, on the one hand, Western researchers interpret ethnoculture as a mass culture, on the other hand, they view it as a phenomenon that deviates from national culture and is closed to foreign and alien elements. Uzbek cultural scientists have no such differentiation; they consider ethnoculture as a synonym for national culture[6]. In our opinion, this approach is a product of the influence of collectivism, the communal lifestyle characteristic of the Uzbek people. In Uzbek ethnoculture there were artists who differed from other creators with their high talent. For example, Bakhshis who tell epics for three or four days, gatekeepers who walk on a tightrope, masters of artistic words, modern askies, amazing carvers, masters of practical art can be included in the group of elite creators. Nevertheless, Uzbek cultural scientists try not to notice their elitist characteristics. This means that they accept the above approach as an immutable norm.

The differentiation of culture into mass and elite groups leads to a number of scientific-methodological and controversial approaches; our researchers did not like such disputes, rather they were afraid of encountering the wrath of the authorities.

Ethnoculture is a collection of material and spiritual resources created by the people, the nation in the processes of perception of existence and change in accordance with life goals. It is an attribute of ethnogenesis, a reflection of the life experiences of the people, the nation in the processes of socio-historical emergence and development. In the process of division of labor and professional differentiation, in each specialty there were experienced masters, elites, and many people who popularized the specialty and essentially engaged in this specialty to earn a living and support their families. For the first group, the elite, it was important to perfect the field, make it unique and manifest the creative potential as a divine reality. They sought meaning in the pursuit of maturity, in search, while the second group, the masses, viewed it as a means of subsistence.

What is surprising is that ethnocultural wealth is mostly passed down across generations through widespread, mass-produced copies. Only the names of a few experienced masters and elite artists



have been preserved.

Therefore, Doctor of Philosophy M. Akhmedyanova shows that national theatrical art as a kind of ethnoculture has passed through the stages of popularization and professionalization [7, 115 p.]. The professionalization, i.e. h. The elite theater art emerged on the basis of popular mass performances to form a Russian-Europeanized stage culture. This elitist art and street performances gave rise to networks of popular amateur theaters (folk theatre, puppet theatre, theater for young audiences, theater studios, artist circles). Through these synthesis and transformation processes, Uzbek ethnoculture has become a national cultural reality [8, pp. 72-74]. That is why Uzbek cultural scientists do not separate ethnoculture from national culture, but consider it as a reality. It is observed that it is not the practice but the theory that is left behind. Academician E.E. Bartol'd, E.E. Bertels, A. V. Yakubovsky, T. Kori Niyazov, Oybek, B. Gafurov, Ya. Gulomov, A. Kayumov, E. Yusupov, M. Khairullaev, A. Valiev, S. Shermuhamedov, G. A. Pugachenkova, E. V. Rtveladze and B. Ahmedov made a major contribution. Although their academic works are not directly devoted to the problems of Uzbek ethnoculture:

first, they began scientific, philosophical and ethnological research into the history and culture of the peoples of the region;

secondly, they substantiated the fact that Uzbek ethnoculture arose on the basis of the lifestyle of sedentary and nomadic peoples, common linguistics, confederation and socio-demographic convergence;

thirdly, the tendency towards external integrative relationships, trade and exchange of experiences, reliance on spiritual and moral imperatives and religious beliefs have become the core of Uzbek ethnoculture.

These values and ethnocultural paradigms were formed in complex, sometimes contradictory socio-historical processes. It is still difficult to assess some socio-historical changes; the conflicts included in them could not leave a definite mark on ethnocultural life. For example, it is difficult to assess the hostility and conflicts between the Bukhara, Kokan and Khiva khanates. Neighborhoodism and ethnoegoism, which have lived in the minds of some of our contemporaries, are a complication of these conflicts. By its philosophical and socio-anthropological essence, ethnoculture is a positive reality. It embodies the positive aspects characteristic of the nation and culture, such as the desire to know the world, the creation of wealth, amenities and tools suitable for civilizational development, the honoring of noble values such as human love, friendship, Brotherhood, morality and vitality and the avoidance of inhuman things. " In socio-spiritual life, - writes N.A. Berdyaev, - the priority lies in culture. The goal of society is realized not in politics, not even in economics, but in culture... High cultural development is achieved in of the future not realized in the past" [9, p. 81]. The philosopher emphasizes that the development of society is moving towards civilization and utilitarianism. N.A. Berdyaev, who linked the foundations of culture with religion and divinity, believes that culture fulfills the liberating function of faith in the hearts of people. In fact, "the heart of the people" in our interpretation is ethnoculture. However, we are far from saying that ethnoculture consists only of religion and divinity. Although the Russian philosopher emphasizes the spiritual aspect of culture, it is difficult to imagine a culture without politics and economics. Incidentally, the categories "political culture" and "economic culture" confirm that political and economic realities acquire social significance through culture. For example, could our traditions of nation-statehood be formed and developed



without Uzbek ethnoculture? Of course not. Could ethnoculture be a nationally deterministic phenomenon without being based on socioeconomic relations? Of course not. Political and economic factors not only have a deterministic effect on cultural formation, they are also products of cultural development. Political and economic life can manifest itself only in a certain ethnocultural space and influence the thoughts and aspirations of people with its functional characteristics.

Ethnoculture is characterized by relying on spiritual and moral imperatives that are the product of historical and cultural traditions and people's experiences. Therefore, researchers reveal these ethno-experiences through traditions, customs, rituals, diachronic relationships, and family values. These ethno-experiences embody the necessary factors for the formation of the people and the nation as a social unit. Family researcher R. Zohirov, doctor of philosophy, wrote: "A person recognizes his belonging to this or that ethnic group, culture primarily through his family and family values"[10.67 p.]. Ethnoculture, which has become family and family values, cannot remain indifferent to the individual; it fulfills its positive and socio-humanistic function through the individual. But this influence leads the individual to dialogue with the social being, to cooperation, to "self-education". Communitarianism, collectivism in ethnoculture does not allow a person to live with selfish goals, self-sacrifice and altruism, which is also due to this Eastern paradigm.

The problems of ethnoculture related to the life of the people and the nation are the subject of ethnological research. A.V., who dealt with issues of Uzbek ethnogenesis. Researchers such as Yakubovsky, A. Askarov, B. Ahmedov, K. Shoniyazov, I. Jabbarov analyze socio-historical processes through the synthesis of cultural and spiritual factors. Even the Doctor of Philosophy, Professor I. Jabbarov, who has published notable works on Uzbek ethnography, examines the history of the Uzbek people as a spiritual development [11]. He concludes that it is possible to see the formation of a nation as a nation and a nation as a nation in social and spiritual achievements. The oasis and state of Khorezm are proud of their ethnocultural heritage and are in no way inferior to world-famous city-states such as Rome, Babylon, Athens and Mesopotamia. In this comparison he bases his analysis on the ethnocultural heritage of ancient Khorezm. "The Great Khorezm Empire cannot help but create a great culture." Unfortunately, brutal wars, disasters and various calamities have marred this "great culture". Such examples can be cited again to show their negative impact on Uzbek ethnoculture. However, the retrospective analysis acquires objectivity and rationality when compared with the previous state of the object (Uzbek ethnoculture). Such an approach requires an awareness of facts, figures and the current state of events. Retrospectivity is the beginning of objectivity, but its coherence and dynamism lies in perspective. No matter how much positive we look for and find in retrospective ethnoculture, it ultimately has its justification if it serves to clarify the object perspective. With a retrospective approach, it is easy to deviate into fakeness, but it is very difficult to free an object from fakeness. Even well-known historians and anthropologists sometimes try to avoid objective facts, either for economic reasons or for fear of censorship.

The falsification of ethnological and ethnocultural facts can also be the result of a lack of knowledge.

Elements of traditionality and modernity, rationality and irrationality, objectivity and subjectivity are constant in ethnoculture, because these antipodes are found not only in ethnoculture, but also



in the cognitive process itself.

Resolving this conflict is an epistemological problem that requires further research.

Main conclusions

First, the philosophical and ethnological study of ethnoculture is necessary to determine the features of the formation and development of a people, a nation.

It is not enough to highlight the connection of ethnoculture with ethnogenesis, it is more important to show their importance in the life and development of the people, the nation.

Secondly, it is common to view ethnoculture as a retrospective reality. Cultural scientists and ethnologists rarely examine it in perspective. Even famous sociologists don't dare do that. Freeing ethnoculture from the burden of historicity is not easy, in most cases even impossible. We can only learn ethnoculture by living in it. We must also recognize that our thoughts are limited.

Third: As long as there is a nation, there is also an ethnoculture. However, ethnoculture can either split off the issue or lag behind. The regressive effect of social disasters must not be forgotten.

Fourth, the task of future studies is to reveal the different characteristics of realities such as ethnoculture, national culture and elite culture.

Fifth, socio-humanistic values in Uzbek ethnoculture - strengthening the institution of family, preserving diachronic ties, teaching the young generation to creative life and spiritual maturity - remain an urgent task.

Practical suggestions and recommendations:

1. It is necessary to continue scientific-theoretical and philosophical-methodological research on ethnoculture.
2. It is desirable to publish a scientific journal entitled "Ethnoculture" or "Ethnological Studies" in Uzbek, Russian and English languages.
3. There is an opportunity to organize an electronic library and sell CDs with lectures by famous ethnologists, ethnographers and historians.
4. In front of the Institute of Manuscripts named after Beruni, it is necessary to organize the "Elshunos Scholars' Alley" covering the Ulugbek complex and to hold educational events.
5. It is necessary to include the subject "Uzbek ethnoculture" in the educational programs of the Uzbek DSMI.

References:

1. Nietzsche F. Works in two volumes. Volume 1. - Moscow: Mysl, 1990.
2. Philosophical culture. Establishment and development. - St. Petersburg: Lan, 1996.
3. Bromley Yu.M. Created by mankind. -Moscow: Politizdat, 1979.
4. Culture. Study guide. -Moskov: Humanit. ed. VLADOS center, 2003.
5. [https:// cyberleninka ru.article sv...](https://cyberleninka.ru/article/sv...)
6. Adullaev M. Fundamentals of cultural studies. - Fergana, FSU, 1996; Boboev H., Khamroev T., Alimasov V. Cultural studies. -Tashkent: New Century Generation, 2001; Shermuhamedov S., Ochildiev A. Culture and civilization.- Tashkent: 1997; Valiev B. Economic culture. -Tashkent: "Spirituality", 2004.
7. Ahmetganova M. Theater and spiritual recipient: philosophical-existential analysis.-Tashkent:



"Innovasya ziyo", 2022.

8. Alimasov V. Philosophy of culture. -Tashkent: "Intellect of the Wise", 2023.

9. Berdyaev N.A. About culture // Reader on cultural studies. - Moscow: Publishing house. "Center", 1993.

10. Zahirov R. Issues of strengthening intergenerational relations in the family (social-philosophical approach). - Opposite: "Nasaf", 2019.

11. Jabbarov I. Uzbek ethnography. -Tashkent: "Teacher", 1999; Jabbarov I. A place of high culture and spirituality. -Tashkent: "Uzbekistan", 2012.

