

Aliyeva Ziyodakhan Abdughafir kizi
Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages,
department of the integrated course of English language teaching

FUTUROLOGY AS A SCIENCE AND AS A PREDICTION (SOCIAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECT)

The need for unambiguity is a basic characteristic of our consciousness. Even in ancient times, thinkers realized the fact that human life is an uncontrolled journey through time - a constant movement into the future - and began to create images of the future through the knowledge of the surrounding world in all its diversity. The future is not straightforward and unambiguous, it conceals many possibilities, although with varying degrees of probability. In this regard, the American writer Robert Penn Warren once said: "... if you cannot accept the past and its burdens, you have no future, for without one there is no other ... only from the past can you build a future" [1, p. 533].

Key words: futurology, future, prognosis, philosophy, myth, phenomenon

Systematized philosophical ideas about the past and, much later, about the future as categories different from the present, were developed by thinking only in the process of long-term development. "Philosophy has always not only interpreted its era, but also indicated the paths for the further development of humanity... At the end of the 20th - beginning of the 21st centuries, the influence of philosophy increased even more, it became a public phenomenon, one of the most important factors in public life..." [2, p. 394].

The growth of the influence of philosophy was associated with a number of factors: firstly, it was caused by the processes of integration of the world community, and secondly, the development of fundamental science. Among the factors that influenced the growth of the influence of philosophy, we would especially like to note the concern of scientists about the state of socio-natural processes. The rapid development of science and the technology generated by it constituted an object, the forecasting of the states of which allowed us to draw conclusions about the future of humanity. In 1955, the American mathematician and physicist, the founder of cybernetics Baron von Neumann formulated the "postulate of limited diversity: the quantitative composition of the planet's inhabitants, the energy of their actions have a quantitative limit - the planetary sphere. Violation of the limit leads to collapse" [3, pp. 93-94]. It is the inevitable collapse, i.e. a catastrophe on a planetary scale, that threatens future generations. The issues that worry scientists point to the very same socio-natural processes that are leading our planet to collapse. These processes have always accompanied humanity to one degree or another, but they have never had such a planetary scale as they do today. For the first time in human history, anthropogenic impact has begun to threaten its own security. A special direction of the "philosophy of the future" has emerged, logically following from the prognostic function of philosophy, which, as is known, is one of the key ones. The meaning and purpose of this function is to make well-founded forecasts regarding the future. The term "futures studies" for the newly emerged direction was proposed by the German sociologist Osip Flechtheim in 1943.

At the initial stage, futurology as a phenomenon of prognostic thought was revealed in the classical works of foreign researchers D. Gabor, J. Feinberg from the point of view of its constructive possibilities. In the second half of the twentieth century, the new "science of the future" began to develop intensively. Futurologists attempted to predict the development of human civilization, based on observed trends and expected events; subtly noticed qualitative changes in people's lifestyles, shifts in the value system of society or important technological innovations were taken as a basis. General problems of the methodology of futurological forecasts were formulated by futurologists O. Helmer, J. McGale, R. Jungk, A. Lausdale. F. Polak in his work "The Image of the Future" determined the similarity of futurology and art in their focus on constructing the image of the future. Of course, long before the term "futures studies" emerged, there were philosophical and prognostic theories that derived the future picture of the world from the state of contemporary society. "The first understanding of the flow of time appeared in the

myths of antiquity, and then received further development in the works of the ancient Greek philosophers Plato, Aristotle, Zeno of Elea" [4, p. 164-165]. But for centuries, these ideas did not go beyond the framework of prophecies, mystifications and predictions, which, in essence, were the sources of modern futurology. A significant contribution to the development of the concept of the future was made by world religious systems: Judaism, Christianity and Islam, for the first time offering a holistic view of the issue under consideration. In the Middle Ages, T. More and T. Campanella in their utopias made attempts to philosophically understand the concept of the future, taking into account political and social realities. Prognostic thought received further development in the New Age, when utopian socialists A. Saint-Simon, C. Fourier and R. Owen "unwittingly laid the foundations of the socialism and communism of K. Marx and F. Engels" [5, p. 117]. The principles of forecasting are further developed in the works of such thinkers as J. Baudrillard, N. Ya. Danilevsky, N. Luhmann, K. Popper, A. Toynbee, O. Spengler and many others. Attempts at a comprehensive analysis of human development trends based on the use of the historical method were made by K. Jaspers and P. Sorokin. An invaluable contribution to the study of the problems of the future was made by Russian philosophers N. A. Berdyaev, V. I. Vernadsky and K. E. Tsiolkovsky.

At present, the creative rethinking of the above-mentioned idea of F. Aquinas is particularly relevant. Humanity, having focused on the material, began to forget the ideal, the spiritual and, in the words of the great thinker of the Middle Ages, "is trying to grab itself by the tail and is spinning in place." From the very moment of the advent of technology, man wanted to conquer nature with its help. However, the success of the development of natural sciences and the technologies generated by them became especially noticeable against the unfavorable background of the decline of the humanities, primarily philosophy. Technogenic civilization began to develop dynamically, in its "achievement of the kingdom of freedom" humanity did not pay sufficient attention to the consequences generated by technology and the uncontrolled exploitation of natural resources.

In the 60s of the XX century. a book by the American professor of sociology S. Hetzler appeared, in which it was directly stated that "...technology is essentially a system of social and physical connections and modes of interaction between man and the mechanisms with which he works. Technology is a socio-technical entelegy containing the seeds of its own growth, which can... grow independently of... more superficial social and economic factors..." [8, p. 293]. Moreover, Hetzler saw "the creation of new concepts so necessary for the theory and planning of development" exclusively in "understanding the essence of the relationship between man and machine" [8, p. 294].

Such a hymn to technification was convenient in order to escape from the analysis of real social reality and the trends of its development into the world of technocratic social forecasting, where the scientific and technological revolution is identified with the social one, and pressing social problems requiring immediate solutions are postponed to an indefinite happy technocratic future.

As a result, today the issue of the environmental consequences of the development of technogenic civilization is one of the first on the agenda of social and humanitarian discourse. These issues are dealt with, in particular, by the so-called technologically determined futurology, the main subject of the predictive analysis of which are the trends in the development of the scientific and technological revolution and its consequences. American futurologist A. Toffler, who shares the concerns of scientists about the destructive impact of technogenic civilization, nevertheless looks to the future of society with optimism. Paradoxically, this authoritative thinker proposes to find a way out of the current difficult situation precisely on the basis of further development of technologies [9, p. 296]. It should be noted that Toffler means technologies primarily information; in his opinion, on the basis of the development of these technologies the world will be able to continue the path of endless improvement [9, p. 240]. A. Toffler's positive views on the future of society are shared by J. Galbraith. He suggests that the emergence of a new generation of managers who will focus their activities not on profit, but on public interests, will have a beneficial effect on the development of society [10, p. 165].

In our opinion, the future is not fatal, it is formed under the influence of the ideas and interests of political, economic and scientific elites, and the task of scientific forecasting of the future is not to

determine the strict framework for the development of society, but to develop universal standards for forecasting taking into account the trends in the development of the economy, politics and culture, including science and technology, both on a global scale and within individual states. This is why attempts to consider the future as something unambiguous are untenable. The famous French sociologist R. Aron wrote in his book “Disappointment in Progress...”: “It is good that people now think more about the future, and do not consider it as something predetermined” [13, p. 221]. Thus, one can assume the imperfection of the method of futurological extrapolations itself, used by futurologists more often than other methods of studying the future. As a rule, in the future, the leading tendencies become those that are either absent or barely noticeable in the present and past. Extrapolation (from the Latin extra – above, outside and polio – correct, change) in this case is understood as the extension of conclusions obtained from observation of one part of the phenomenon to another part.

Taking into account the imperfection of the method of futurological extrapolations, futurology could abandon straightforward extrapolations of existing trends, focusing on reasoning about goals and possible methods for achieving them. Since the main goal of futurological knowledge - building an image of the future - determines the need for the integrity of futurological knowledge itself, which, in our opinion, can be achieved by implementing an interdisciplinary approach to forecasting the future.

Conclusion. For centuries, philosophy has been actively debating the question: is any reliable prediction of the future possible at all. Modern philosophy answers this question in the affirmative, and the following aspects are put forward as justification for this possibility: ontological; epistemological; logical; neurophysiological; social. Let us pay attention to the main provisions of these aspects. The ontological aspect is that foresight is possible from the very essence of being - its objective laws, cause-and-effect relationships. Based on dialectics, the mechanism of development remains unchanged until each qualitative leap, and therefore it is possible to “trace” the future. The epistemological aspect is based on the fact that since the possibilities of cognition are limitless (according to the domestic philosophical tradition), and forecasting is also a type of cognition, then forecasting itself is possible. The logical aspect is based on the fact that the laws of logic always remain unchanged, both in the present and in the future. The neurophysiological aspect is based on the capabilities of consciousness and the brain to anticipate reality. And finally, the social aspect is that humanity strives, based on its own experience of development, to model the future.

REFERENCES:

1. Sadovnichiy V.A. Znanie i mudrosti v globa-lizuyushemsya mire // Filosofiya i budushee sivilizatsii: tezisi dokladov i vystupleniy 4 Rossiyskogo filosofskogo kongressa (Moskva, 24–28 maya 2005 g.): v 5 t. M., 2005. T. 5.
2. Vpered! XXI vek: perspektivi, prognozi, futurologi. Antologiya sovremennoy klassi cheskoj prognostiki 1952–1999 / red.-sost. I.V. Bestujev-Lada. M., 2000.
3. Gutorov V.A. Antichnaya sotsialnaya utopiya: voprosi istorii i teorii. L., 1989.
4. Kosolapov V.V., Goncharenko A.N. XXI vek v zerkale futurologii. M., 1987.
5. Abdullin A.R. Osnovi globalistiki. Ufa, 1999.
6. Gaydenko V.P. Ob iskhodnix ponyatiyax doktrini F. Akvinskogo. M., 2001.
7. Hetzler S. Technological growth and social change. L., 1969.
8. Vayszeker E., Lovins E., Lovins L. Faktor chetire. Zatrata – polovina, otdacha – dvoynaya. M., 2000.
9. Aron R. Razocharovaniye v progresse. Dialektika sovremennoy obshestva. Niyu-York, 1968.