

Philosophical analysis of the notion of nonviolence

¹Inagamova Feruza Xurshitovna, ²N.A.Rahimbabaeva, ³G. Abdullahanova, ⁴N. Alimatova, ⁵U.Kudratova

Abstract--- *This article presents a philosophical and conceptual analysis of the concept of nonviolence. The dialectics of violence and nonviolence have been thoroughly analyzed. The opinions of many scholars in this area have been analyzed. The issue of use and non-use of force is now considered to be one of the major but major issues in society.*

Keywords--- *Use of force, nonviolence, morality, humanism, dialectics, philosophical concepts, social environment*

I. Introduction

Mankind has experienced many stages and stages of development. Obviously, there will be times and times when certain ideas and doctrines will become obsolete. In some areas, these doctrines are completely transformed, and in others, they are polished and replenished. One such teaching is the doctrine of nonviolent ethics. Nonviolent ethics is one of the teachings that have emerged in the 20th century and have been successful in practice and are still practiced today. Nonviolent morality is the struggle against evil from the standpoint of morality without violence. An Iranian writer and wise Hussein Kozim said: "The value of all the gold and earth underground is not the same as good morals." It is so realistic that a person will continue to be confident in his or her life. It is well known that the eradication, or rather the reduction, of the evil in the East has always been a major moral issue. Ancient and medieval thinkers of the ancient world believed that the way to weaken evil was to not respond with evil against it. In their teachings, they believed that failure to respond evil to evil was possible only through patience and abandonment to God.

At the beginning of the nonviolent ethical course is the 19th-century American philosopher Henry David Thoreau (1817 - 1862). In his view, he argues that the fight against violence should be fought, not through patience or abandonment to God. Within this area, later, the 20th century. In the beginning, Lev Tolstoy and later great Indian thinker and public figure Mohammad Karamchand Gandhi, American philosopher, philosopher and public

¹National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

²Tashkent State University of Economics

³Tashkent State University of Economics

⁴Tashkent State University of Economics

⁵Tashkent State University of Economics

figure Martin Luther King Jr. did research. Also, such scholars as the US scientist, Professor Jin Sharp, Polish scientist Andrzej Gjegorchik, Russian scientist, Professor Abdusalom Guseynov have also done research in this area.

Toro, the founder of this line, chooses to live a comfortable life in the American society he dislikes, and promotes nonviolent ethics and nonviolence in his articles and essays, such as "Walden or the Forest," "Civil Disobedience," "Slavery in Massachusetts." Toro comes up with the idea of a nonviolent revolution. The first is that everyone sees tax evasion. In his view, if thousands of people do not pay taxes, it is neither violent nor bloody; on the contrary, as long as the tax continues, the state will have the opportunity to commit violence and shed innocent blood. Second, the strike is the refusal of civil servants to carry out their duties. Then a peaceful, bloody revolution will take place. But before these stages, each person must undergo a stage of moral preparation - a personal revolution in his mind and heart. Only high-level moral training can achieve the ultimate goal.

II. Literature review

Lev Tolstoy's approach to nonviolence helps to clarify the essence of this direction. This can be seen in a document that is unique to us - in his correspondence with the Uzbek intelligent Ubaydulla Khodjaev. Tolstoy's words are remarkable. On the basis of "not evil for evil" "If a person does evil in some way, then there will be one evil; if I resist and retaliate, of course, two evils will be accomplished instead of one evil. If I do not resist, evil will not prevail. Tolstoy's response is important because he considers it to be both the great and the smallest of evil. He was a staunch supporter of the evil way of preserving man, not the evil one. An analysis of sources that address the problem of nonviolence reveals the complexity of the origin and substance of violence, which is a kind of social movement, but also all of the socio-historical features related to problems of good, evil, expediency, rationality, ethics, law and politics. human life is an integral phenomenon on the fronts.

Due to the diversity of approaches to the definition of nonviolence and nonviolence, the complexity of its structure makes it possible to interpret and interpret it. In order to analyze the concept of nonviolence, it is necessary to understand what violence is. On the one hand, violence is often understood as a phenomenon of absolute negativity that cannot be justified. On the other hand, it can be described as the manifestation of a living (human) essence, a social life that combines both positive and negative traits. L.N. Tolstoy understood that the use of violence was the opposite of love, something that would be done outside of the will of another: "Rape is to do what the violent person does not want." In addition, he said that "one of the main causes of human calamities is the false idea that people can improve and regulate other people's lives through violence."

Another thinker, V.I. Krasikov, L.N. Contrary to Tolstoy, the use of force is "direct, physical or mental confrontation, coercive interaction, direct or indirect contact between the principal actors of the conflict of bodies and wills. It states that the "power-subordination" relationship is established as a result of the physical (or physical) effort. He considers the use of violence as the driving force of evolution necessary for social progress. According to the theory of evolution, all modern species of life on the planet have undergone a long evolutionary process under the influence of natural selection and competition.

III. Discussion

The set of physiological and psychological changes that occur in the process of interaction, interaction and coexistence between predation and prey are exemplary, that is, natural selection forces them to adapt to the development of another. The possibility of coercion creates a new relationship between the participants in the system. At the same time, competition within the constituency is aimed at eliminating the weak and ensuring that the most adaptable and powerful members of the constituency repeat themselves.

Thus, the use of force has the task of preserving and improving the category in nature. A person is characterized by this biological trait that during his history has transformed this natural feature into the social forms and species of the Inquisition, terrorism, war and so on. Ultimately, the use of social violence is defined by the fact that there are different interests associated with one or another of the actual needs. The range of needs varies: material and psychological, spiritual and aesthetic needs, love and freedom.

Based on the above, A.A. The definition given by Husseinov is most clear: "Violence is not coercion in any way, and it is not the destruction of one's life or property, but the coercion and harm that is done against their will. The use of force is the destruction of free will. It is a violation of human will. " Will and power are the most important components of the category of abuse. F In Nietzsche's philosophy power is expressed as "the desire for power, the will". For example, I. Kant power is the ability to overcome "great obstacles." The same power is called power if it can overcome the resistance of those who x. Suicide is a controversial issue of whether it is possible to induce self-harassment in a form of abuse. It is especially popular among medieval European clergy. It is noteworthy that "self-immolators" are not only punished for their actions, but also for the purpose of understanding the religious and spiritual truths and identifying themselves. In our view, self-torture cannot be regarded as an act of violence because of the identity of the victim and the victim who freely chose to suffer.

It is clear that violence can be adequately interpreted as a social phenomenon only by comparing it to its opposite - nonviolence. These two interrelated and inconsistent notions show the proportionality of the analysis and the comparison, what their connections are, what the mechanism of the transition from one condition to the other, and how it can be balanced and balanced.

The non-use of force means that it is a deliberate refusal to use force to resolve the conflict. At the same time, nonviolence is similar to the use of force on the active constituent, which is expressed in perseverance, reliability, resistance, and, in a different way, has the same pattern - aggression. The use of violence as an active resistance to injustice should be distinguished from patience as a compromise - not a struggle against violence, but a willingness to recognize and accept it. Nonviolence can change not only an individual but also society as a whole, preventing a quick return to physical struggle.

Of course, nonviolence is a more complex and improved way of resolving disputes over violence and therefore requires much more effort. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that it is the only way to justice: "Nonviolence shifts the goals and means of struggle to a qualitatively homogeneous plane, focusing not only on the empirical implications of injustice, but also on their internal basis. break the chain of use and take the human relationship to another level. "

The unity of nonviolence and nonviolence in nature and society. M. Kovalev looks at it from a variety of perspectives and insists that they are in harmony. Progress can only be made by the interaction of two opposing

aspects in interpersonal and social societies. Answering the question of self-defense and self-defense, A.M. Kovalev links natural processes. Just as a wild animal has been forced to protect itself and its offspring by nature, a person must sometimes protect himself, his child, or the weaker in society.

But how to determine the limits of non-violence and nonviolence in nature and society? Violence is required to save lives, ie to protect and to protect themselves. The use of nonviolent violence for self-defense and self-defense is morally corrupt. Thus, the limits of the use of violence are established and, accordingly, it is possible and necessary to limit the use of violence. Violence can be limited by building a socially just society, but A. M. Koalev noted that this does not exclude the use of violence at all.

A. M. We consider Kovalev's concept to be the most acceptable level of absolute coercion and extreme violence between the extreme poles, since one cannot exist without the other, and together they form the harmony of the universe. M. In his work, Kovalev convincingly demonstrates this in certain examples of the survival and development of nature and society.

D. L. Using the typology created by Cedi, we can describe a variety of contemporary and classical concepts in the form of non-violence - the scale of violence. The left-hand side of this scale is non-violent, and the right-hand side is absolute violence. Here, L. N. Tolstoy's idea of "nonviolently resisting evil" is embedded in the Hindu religious doctrine of not harming all living things. Near it - M. Gandhi and M.-L. King's concepts stand. We also introduce pacifist, anti-self-defense researchers here (A. Forchun).

Researchers positively assessing the experience of nonviolence - A. A. Guseynov, L. N. Vshivtseva, E. D. The point of Meleshko and others is that they are in the immediate vicinity - not to resort to absolute violence. J Sharp's theory that permits "bipartisan" methods of nonviolent protest is closer to the center. Finally, A. M. Kovalev's view is clearly in the middle - there is a combination of violence and nonviolence in society. L.N. Tolstoy's opponent. A. Ilin's view is close to him, but is closer to the right end of the scale (absolute violence), which he believes is coercion and coercion necessary, and he sets the boundaries in his work "On Force Resistance to Evil." Then there are many more ideas and opinions between "excellent moderate" and "absolute abuse", the most important being A. Meyers and R. G. Apresian views. Their ideas can be combined with the formula "nonviolence is equivalent to covert violence".

V. Meyers thoroughly investigates the underlying causes of political influence and its success without resorting to violence, saying it is nothing more than covert violence. He creates his own concept of nonviolence, saying that violence should be restricted. But this restriction is I. A. It differs from Ilin's "violent resistance to evil." V. According to Meyers, self-defense and self-defense are only needed in their reasonable, strictly limited form. In other words, V. Meyers dramatically changed the usual notion of nonviolence: V. For Meyers, nonviolence is a deliberate use of violence, and its limits are as follows - rape is an excellent proportion to protect and defend the state, but such use should not be deceptive, hypocritical, not detainable.

The classic concept of nonviolence is V. According to Meyers, it leads to abuse⁶.

⁶ Meyers W. Nonviolence and Its Violent Consequences. URL: <http://www.iiipublishing.com/books/non-violence.htm>

R. G. Apresyan believes that the ideologists of the classical concept of nonviolence make serious mistakes. R. G. Apesian believes that force can be used, but only within a limited framework, which means that I. A. Ilin's L. N. Admits that he was right in a dispute with Tolstoy. R. G. According to Apesian, "resistance is the realization of active, moral, social, political, legal, and law enforcement actions aimed at creating conditions in which no dangerous actions are possible." 413]. R. G. Apresyan argues that even the most varied theory of nonviolence in Christian denominations is not supported by all. But the opposite is also true: it is not right that evil should be repaid. The more destructive the force of resistance to violent actions, the greater the likelihood that we will consider violence.

The limits of the use of force and nonviolence are traditionally established, depending on the answer to the question of whether violence can be used for protection and self-defense. V. Meyers and R. Apresyan believes that violence is possible even in the physical form. But the only evidence for such use is to protect the vulnerable, such as the elderly or the child. Otherwise, nonviolence can lead to evil and murder. That is why R. Apresyan and V. Meyers is a supporter of the use of violence. Such an understanding of the limits of nonviolence and nonviolence is as close as possible to Russian Orthodox traditions. R. Apesian and V. Meyers will continue to go that direction and make it clear. In our view, the real criterion for limiting life-threatening physical violence is that it can be used for protection or self-defense in the event of a last resort where none of the methods described in classical concepts can be used without effect. The use of physical violence in situations that are not life-threatening or verbal abuse, psychological or verbal protection or self-defense should be used. These methods have been described and researched by psychologists, but we will not go into detail in this article. One of them is M. We would like to mention that Lithuania is a psycho Aikido method

After them, K., who is a supporter of rape, as close to the right end of the scale as possible. Marx and V. I. Lenin's views stand out. But at the far right end, we do not think of any philosopher, for none of them has ever been in favor of absolute violence in the world. We note that there are no such thinkers because A. A. As Husseinov rightly said, the "ethics of violence" cannot be said. According to our analysis, ethics cannot be based on violence, especially absolute violence; The use of force is for the good, the good, the protection, and the self-defense, but in such cases the use of force is limited. Moreover, a society based on the use of violence in real life cannot be established because such a society would soon be self-destructive. The use of absolute violence is a utopia or a fantasy, just like the use of absolute violence.

IV. Conclusion

It has been said clearly and definitely: we need a clear and skillful composition of action, the speech of the characters, devoid of pretentiousness, so that everything together is not outwardly bright, but truly beautiful. And, we repeat: "do not transgress the simplicity of nature." All deviations from these principles — pretentiousness of style, sophistication of expressions, artificial tonality ("The Killing of Gonzago") - are called upon to make for us a life-truthful and complex composition of action and, in essence, a conditional form of speech of characters speaking in poetic language. The "simplicity of nature" in art is achieved by no means simple means.

References

- [1] Tolstoy L.N. The kingdom of God is within you. 1890–1893. M. : 1955.T. 28.p. 191.
- [2] Tolstoy L.N. Way of life. M. : 1956.V. 45.
- [3] Nietzsche F. Will to power. Experience revaluating all values. M. : Thought, 2005.880 p.
- [4] Kant. I. On the criticism of the ability of judgment. M.: Thought, 1966.V. 5. 420 p.
- [5] Meyers W. Nonviolence and Its Violent Consequences. URL: <http://www.iiipublishing.com/books/non-violence.htm>
- [6] Nazaretyan A. P. Violence and non-violence in historical retrospective // Historical Psychology and Sociology of History. - 2008. - T. 1. - No. 1.
- [7] Kuzina S. I., Romanova V. A. Education of a culture of non-violence in the educational process as ensuring the spiritual security of Russian society // State and municipal administration. Scholarly notes of SKAGS. - 2015. - No. 3.
- [8] Huseynov A. A. Ethics of non-violence // Questions of philosophy. - 1992. - T. 3. - S. 72.
- [9] Pryakhin N. G. The philosophy of non-violence: history and modernity (socio-philosophical analysis): dis. - SPb. : Nikolai Gennadyevich Pryakhin, 2006.
- [10] Pryakhin N. G. The problem of non-violence and non-action in Eastern philosophy and culture (Ancient India-Ancient China) // Human World. - 2007. - No. 4. - S. 9-9.
- [11] Khazina A. V., Basov A. Yu., Mikautadze O. G. "Ethics of non-violence" in the Hellenistic era: the case of the Stoic Posidonius // Modern Scientist. - 2017. - No. 6. - S. 308-312.
- [12] Mamajonova, G. K. (2019). The role of bioethics in fostering the family's spiritual foundations. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 28(12), 397-401.
- [13] Mamazonova, Gulnoz Karimovna (2019) "ROLE OF BIOETHICS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MEDICINE AS A CULTURAL FORM," *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 7 , Article 27.