



PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF KARL POPPER'S DOCTRINE

Muxriddin Sherboboyev

Researcher of National University of Uzbekistan

E-mail: msherboboev@bk.ru

<https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7768960>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 16th March 2023

Accepted: 24th March 2023

Online: 25th March 2023

KEY WORDS

Philosophy, knowledge, science, society, state, development, scientific, revolution, paradigm, structure.

ABSTRACT

Any views are based on socio-political environment as well as previous ideas. Popper, like all philosophers, was a product of his time. But the basis of his knowledge in the field of philosophy was based on succession. Although he criticized some layers of the previous philosophical heritage, he never denied the succession in the middle. In this article, we will try to study the philosophical foundations of Karl Popper's teaching.

Introductuion. To understand Popper's philosophy, we can refer to two of his obscure but very interesting articles below. 1. "How do I understand philosophy"; 2. The following are reflected in his articles known as "Immanuel Kant - Enlightenment, Philosopher of Freedom, Humanity and Conscience". In the first, Popper expressed his original opinion about philosophy and its nature, place and role in human life, and in the second, it is a commemorative speech on the London radio dedicated to the 150th anniversary of Kant's death. Popper's philosophy is usually interpreted as a continuation of the philosophy of positivism, a study of his ideas proves that this idea is not correct. Shishkov writes about this: "K. Popper's philosophy is not only sharply different from the entire positivist tradition, but directly opposes it" [1.4]. Observing the thoughts related to his rejection of the philosophy of positivism, we can observe his departure from the positivist tradition, first of all, in the line of attitude towards the foundation of knowledge. The problem of substantiation of knowledge is one of the historical philosophical, fundamental problems, and the attitude to this problem arises from the attitude of each philosopher to the truth. The philosophy of positivism accepted emotional perception as the only reliable source of rational knowledge and relied on the classical view of rationality. This provides the opportunity to gain the most effective and reliable knowledge for self-realization.

We can see that these views of positivists rely on the law of sufficient reason for the validity of human knowledge. This principle goes back to Aristotle's metaphysical ideal. Its content is considered as the search for the "Archimedean fulcrum" of knowledge (in which authority is a criterion of the reliability or unreliability of human knowledge).

This essentially fundamentalist, traditional methodology prevailed in classical and modern philosophy until the 20th century. Later, due to the change of the general cultural situation, and first of all, the situation in science, the foundations of fundamentalism began to be



undermined. The traditional appeal to reason and experience destroyed the centuries-old Socratic views of Western culture of the 20th century. It turned out that the human mind is very changeable, which led to the understanding that its mistakes and conclusions serve as a reliable foundation for the future of man.

Literature review

The philosopher decided to move away from positivist philosophy due to the question of the criteria for the foundation of knowledge. This traditional approach was transformed into a critical system by Descartes and Hegel through criticism of environment, Wittgenstein through negation, and Popper through denial. Of course, if we proceed from the fact that our intuitions cannot reveal the complete truth to us, the opinions of Popper and other supporters of rational philosophy turn out to be correct.

K. Popper was one of the first in European philosophy to revive the issue of error in the human mind. Of course, this anti-fundamental idea also originated from the Greeks and was reflected in the ideas of Socrates. In the pre-Socratic period, we can see traces of such ideas in the philosophy of Xenophanes. In particular, he writes: "Our knowledge consists of vague hypotheses" [1.5]. According to Popper, a person can never reach the truth. Because he, as a supporter of the idea of agnosticism and skepticism, believed that these views are a unique impetus to human knowledge.

Inspired by the thought of Xenophanes, the idea of the complexity of human knowledge spread widely in the teaching of Socrates, in Hellenistic philosophy, especially in the teaching of Cynics, Cyrenes, and skeptics, and through them entered European classical philosophy. F. Bacon founded the fallibilist methodology with his doctrine of induction. The critical philosophy of J. Fries and the pragmatism of C. Peirce served to pave the way for Popper-type modern fallibilism.

Unlike the fundamentalist philosophy of Descartes, K. Popper's criticism does not allow any dogmas, besides, it is distinguished by the fact that it includes an error in relation to any possible example. While fundamental philosophy tries to develop certain conditions by giving priority to reason or intuitions and making them immune to criticism, anti-fundamental philosophy does not recognize any cases of acceptability and infallibility of criticism. The path of Popper's criticism towards such truth and progress is based on the principle of continuous search for some solutions and replacing them with others. As for how Popper understands philosophy, he explains in his work "How I understand philosophy" [2.447-490]. Popper looks at philosophy based on a unique approach. The proof of this idea is defined by his slogan "All people are philosophers". During the philosopher's thought, he emphasizes that the philosophical observation of some people is deeper. That is, Popper emphasizes the existence of a group of academic philosophers. Popper recognizes the activity of the academic group and emphasizes their place in the life of society, but he is far from the idea of their absolutization. He writes: "I am an opponent of the theory of the existence of an intellectual philosophical elite".[3.9] This opinion is related to the following opinion written in Weismann's notes: "In fact, a philosopher is understood as a person who does not feel insecure in the construction of our concepts." Popper agrees with some of Weismann's views, including that very few philosophers have been truly great, and that few are worthy of admiration. Popper tries not to associate philosophy with the work of certain individuals.



Although the works of the great philosophers are extremely important for philosophy, he emphasizes that philosophy cannot be literally their work. That is, it is a mistake to attribute philosophy to individuals, just as painting is the work of a great artist, and music is the work of a great composer. Popper explains this idea by the fact that Greek philosophy before Socrates pre-determined almost all academic and professional philosophy.

Popper, who believes that some fault lies in professional philosophy in philosophical processes, considers himself guilty among them. He says that professional philosophy must justify its existence in society, it must prove its existence. Popper writes: "I confess my guilt and, like Socrates, I am ready to defend myself." In fact, when we observe the processes taking place in the world today, these thoughts are proven. The role of intellectual potential, the elite layer of society, is invaluable in solving many problems faced by humanity. Because their potential puts responsibility on their shoulders in front of the common people.

In this regard, Popper looks with admiration at the great sage Socrates. Popper looks at Plato's memoirs describing Socrates' process of apologetics, and is struck by the work. He believes that it is correct to apologize from the historical point of view. The work says: "In general, this was a true story of what Socrates said in front of the Athenian palace. I admire him: here was a humble, sarcastic and fearless man speaking. His defense is very simple: he is aware of his intellectual limitations, he realizes that he is not wise, except perhaps for clarity: he knows that he knows nothing, he criticizes himself and all proud aristocrats; but above all, he will remain a loyal citizen to his neighbors, friends, and the Athenian state." We can see that this is an impressive defense not only of Socrates, but also of philosophy. In fact, such courage of Socrates has a deep place in the history of philosophy, and we have witnessed its embodiment in the philosophy of all nations. In particular, the fact that in the Eastern philosophical worldview Socrates created metaphors such as Socrates the ruler and wise Socrates confirms the above points.

Research Methodology. Popper's philosophical outlook was significantly influenced by the works of great philosophers. Speaking about professional philosophy, he emphasizes the following: "In my opinion, many philosophers, including some great ones, are guilty. In this regard, I would like to mention four great philosophers: Plato, Hume, Spinoza and Kant»[3.10].

When it comes to Plato, Popper praises him as a great poet and writer, philosopher and the founder of a large philosophical school. However, criticizing Plato's views on society, he considers it "disgusting and terrible". The reason why Popper came to this idea was Plato's views on the "Ideal Society". The selection of people in this society was an undemocratic theory. Of course, from the point of view of the time, this idea was an important step for the state to be strong. But the disappearance of the institution of the family and the absence of a place for the disabled was shockingly inhumane.

"Plato's main mistake," says Popper, "like many philosophers after him, his weakness was his belief in the elite theory." Unlike other philosophers, Socrates correctly formed the attitude towards people in society. While Socrates demanded wisdom from the statesman, he believed that he should know how little he knew, while Plato believed that a sage, a philosopher, a scientist should be a statesman, even an absolute ruler. While studying the philosophical ideas of Plato and Socrates, Popper tries to compare their social views. In



addition, when talking about a person, his opinion on the issue of knowledge is considered. While Socrates emphasized that man's ability to know is limited, Plato created a Gnostic doctrine by glorifying the ability of philosophers to know.

One of the next philosophers to be analyzed in depth was David Hume. He is not a professional philosopher but has been described as the most sincere and balanced philosopher among the great philosophers like Socrates. In addition, K. Popper said, he was a humble, reasonable and very indifferent person who was deceived by his failed and wrong psychological theory. David Hume's theory of knowledge, which taught him to distrust the remarkable powers of the mind, gave rise to his next terrifying theory. Later, he found many supporters: "The mind serves as a slave of emotions, and it should be and will remain so. He cannot claim a role other than to serve and obey the passions" [4.415].

Popper admits that the sublime can never be achieved without emotion, and yet he takes a different course from Hume's philosophy. According to Popper, the only hope for humanity is to curb the passions with the limited rationality that a class of people are capable of. Popper challenges the issue of limited rationality in human life in Hume's philosophy. In fact, there are some elements of human emotions that can be an obstacle to the development of society and the state. It is not always possible to live with emotions, and in most cases we have to control emotions with reason. There is a principle of "The heart is king, the mind is the minister" in the medieval Eastern philosophy, and based on this idea, a unique philosophical combination is reflected. Reason and emotion are equally necessary elements for human development, but not using them properly can lead to great tragedies. It can be said that K. Popper's theory serves as a basis for using both concepts.

Another later philosopher was Spinoza, who was not a professional philosopher like Socrates and Hume and created a completely different doctrine from Hume. Popper claims that his philosophy is not only wrong, but also morally unacceptable. Like Hume, he was a determinist philosopher. He did not recognize the free will of man and believed that free will is a delusion of intuition.

Popper writes: "In Spinoza's opinion, as long as there is passion, we remain in its nets and cannot be freed from it. As soon as we form a clear and clear idea about it, we make it a part of our consciousness. And this only creates freedom»[3.11]. This doctrine of Spinoza seems to Popper to be an unreasonable and dangerous form of rationalism, although he is a rationalist. He gives one reason for this.

First, he says that he does not believe in determinism, and that neither Spinoza nor anyone else has advanced any serious arguments in defense of determinism, or arguments that reconcile determinism with human freedom and common sense. For example, it is true that most (but not all) of what we do is obvious and even predictable.

Second, although it is true that sensual inclinations—what Spinoza calls "affects"—do not make us free, we are only responsible for our actions until we form a clear and correct rational idea.

In Spinoza's philosophy, the issue of a person's need to be able to consciously control his emotions in any relationship is on the agenda, but he says that this can be achieved through determinism. This is criticized by Popper because these ideas did not correspond to his



theory. It is not acceptable for a person to be limited by some factors. This led to criticism of Spinoza's ideas.

Among the great philosophers, Immanuel Kant is one of the most amazing and famous thinkers. Popper credits Hume's efforts to solve Hume's problem of free thought and Spinoza's problem of determinism, but both failed. Kant was one of the philosophers who believed in enlightenment. Popper's position in relation to Kant differs from the generally accepted view today. When Popper saw a glimpse of the Enlightenment in Kant, others considered him a philosopher who denied the Enlightenment.

Analysis and results. While looking at the work of the above philosophers, Popper acknowledges their achievements, of course, but emphasizes that they are responsible for the work they have not done in front of society as professional philosophers. Denying determinism, he rejects the idea that every philosopher is a child of his time. If the group of famous philosophers also adapts to their time, then from whom does the society expect changes and updates. In fact, as stated in Toinbee's concept of call and response, there is always a call in society, and people who are considered mature strata of society should respond to it. Although Popper's thought does not correspond to these ideas, there are some similarities.

Later, he was also interested in the opinions of artists of his time and expressed his opinion to them. In particular, he writes: "I have always defended philosophy and even metaphysics against the Vienna circle, and yet I had to admit a certain failure of philosophers to face real philosophical problems of varying degrees of seriousness and difficulty" [3.11]. Popper, who divides philosophical problems into two parts, says that the level of his criticality is determined by the philosopher. In fact, professional philosophers themselves form the basis of criticism. Because, according to Popper, their presence determines the level of solving problems in society. If we look at one of Bacon's thoughts, he answered the question of what qualities a scientist should have: it should not remain stagnant, a real scientist should collect honey from flowers like bees and bring benefits to all parties." In fact, the potential of a scientist or a philosopher should be determined not only by his own interest, but also by the nature and society that surrounds him. Popper's responsibility for the philosopher is exactly the same as Bacon's demand for the scientist.

Popper's contemporaries, Wittgenstein and members of the Vienna Circle, denied the existence of serious philosophical problems. Nevertheless, at the end of their thoughts, they emphasize that they are philosophical problems and linguistic problems related to the meaninglessness of their words. Wittgenstein denied that there were any real problems or real puzzles, and later he began to talk more about conundrums, that is, the difficulties or misunderstandings that arise from the misuse of philosophical language. Popper adds to this that if there were no serious philosophical problems and no hope of solving them, we would not be justified in walking in society as philosophers. In this case, he says that the existence of a philosophy without problems cannot be justified. .

Popper described a collection of thoughts on the issue of philosophy and activity in his work entitled "How I understand philosophy". The reason for this was misunderstandings in philosophy and activity. We will briefly quote his comments.



"First of all, the main task of philosophy is not to eliminate mistakes, although this is necessary as a preparatory process.

Secondly, I do not think of philosophy as a gallery of works of art, of amazing and peculiar pictures of the world, or of its rational and extraordinary descriptions.' According to Popper, we do the great philosophers a complete injustice by understanding philosophy in this way. Great philosophers do not pursue purely aesthetic goals. "They didn't want to be architects of complex systems; on the contrary, like all great scientists, they were, first of all, seekers of truth, finders of real solutions to real problems. I look at the history of philosophy as a whole as the history of the search for truth» [5.89-97], - says Popper and rejects its purely aesthetic value.

Popper calls people to be brave and brave in terms of learning. A person cannot be an intellectual coward and a seeker of truth at the same time. "Whoever seeks the truth must dare to be wise. Therefore, he must be a revolutionary in the field of thought," says Popper.

"Thirdly, I do not consider the history of philosophical knowledge to be the history of intellectual capacity in which various ideas are tested and truth is obtained as a by-product," says Popper.

Such words or concepts cannot be true or false. Our goal here is not to analyze meanings, but to search for interesting and basic truths, that is, true theories.

"Fifth, I do not consider philosophy to be a tool for defining rationality." That is, it is certainly not correct to attribute rationality to only one philosophy.

"Sixth, I do not consider philosophy to be mental therapy, that is, a kind of activity in which people get rid of their philosophical confusion." According to K. Popper, in his later works, Wittgenstein did not show a way out of the fly trap, as he used to say. He argues that the type of activity attributed to this philosophy, in fact, does not apply to it.

"Seventh, I do not see that philosophy seeks to express itself clearly. Accuracy and punctuality are not intellectual values in themselves, and we should never try to be more precise than the problem at hand requires.' Because philosophical knowledge is an abstract type of general knowledge. For this reason, Popper does not demand precision from philosophy, like representatives of positivist philosophy.

"Eighth, philosophy is a type of activity that deals with the creation of new theories to solve problems that may arise in the future."

"Ninthly, I do not understand philosophy as understanding the spirit of the times." This is Hegel's idea, and it is an idea that has not stood up to scrutiny. Of course, there are fashions in philosophy as well as in science. "However, a person who is serious about the search for truth does not follow fashion, he does not believe in it and can even fight against it"[3.11] says Popper.

K. Popper interprets his opinion that all people are philosophers in this way: even if people do not realize that they are faced with philosophical problems, in any case, they live in philosophical prejudices. According to him, any theory that has not been tested and not critically analyzed is a superstition. Theories that are important for human life are considered wrong in the sense that they are accepted without critical examination.

According to the view related to the existence of a special philosophy, philosophy should critically examine theories and analyze them. But they are uncertain beginnings, and this is



where science and philosophy begin. Any philosophical teaching should be criticized, if it is not criticized, it starts to turn into suspicious and harmful views of the common mind. Later, it becomes more complex, and the ultimate goal is to achieve an enlightened, critical everyday mind, a perspective that clarifies reality and has a less negative impact on human life.

In his views, K. Popper says that "philosophy should never be separated from separate sciences", thereby removing the boundary between science and philosophy set by the positivists, and historically all sciences emerged as the heirs of the Greek philosophical assumptions about the cosmos and the order of the world. he says. The spiritual ancestors of all philosophers are Homer, Thales and others. For them, the main problem was to study the structure of the universe and the place of man in it. Later, the problem of knowing the universe arose, and this problem remains a constant, basic problem for all philosophy.

"I believe that the duty of every intellectual is to understand his place," says K. Popper. He advocates simple, understandable and civilized thinking as much as possible, not forgetting Socratic humility - the understanding of a learned person, about the problems that are troubling humanity, for the solution of which new and bold ideas are needed. Unlike petty philosophers with their petty problems, he bases the main task of philosophy on the importance of critical thinking about the universe and the place of man in it, as well as his cognitive abilities, the possibilities of doing good and evil [6.89-97].

Conclusion/Recommendations. Popper considers all people to be philosophers because they have one or another perspective on life and death. Some believe that life is worthless, a misconception that results from a lack of awareness of the limitations of human life. Popper says that feeling the brevity of life increases its value. In the work of this philosopher, it can be observed that a certain unique worldview was formed by studying philosophical worldviews and commenting on them.

In conclusion, we can say that the spirit and style of Popper's teaching allow us to emphasize that he is a philosopher of the Socrates type. Popper was fascinated by Socrates' way of always seeking and loving the Truth. In fact, Popper's philosophy is not just an admiration of the great Athenian sage, but an attempt to create a new stream of Socraticism in the postmodernist philosophical consciousness. In a word, the essence of K. Popper's philosophy revolves around Socrates' wise saying "I know that I know nothing".

References:

1. Поппер К.Р. Все люди-философы: как я понимаю философию; Иммануил Кант-философ Просвещения. //Пер. с нем., вступи. статьи и примеч. И. З. Шишкова. Изд. 2-е, стереотипное.-М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2003.-С 4.
2. Современная британская философия / Hrsg. Ф. Вайсманн, Х.Д.да. Льюис. 2 Ауфл. Л.: Джордж Аллен и Анвин Лтд., 1961. Серия 3. -С. 447-490.
3. Шишков И.З. В поисках новой рациональности: философия критического разума. - М.: эдиториал УРСС, 2003. -С. 9.
4. Юм Д. Брошюра о человеческой природе. 1739-1740 / Hrsg. Селби-Бигге. Оксфорд: Clarendon Prese. Бух П., Т.Ш. Абшнит Ш. 1888. -С. 415.



5. Muxriddin Azimmurod Ogli Sherboboev (2021). CRITICAL RATIONALISM AS A METHODOLOGICAL MEANS OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE. Academic research in educational sciences, 2 (8), 89-97. doi: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-8-89-97.

6. Chinpulat Minasidinovich Kurbanov, Sharif Safarovich Shaniyazov, Jaloliddin Bakhromovich Nurfayziev, Mukhriddin Azimmurod-ugli Sherboboev. (2020). GEOPOLITICAL AND ECONOMIC INTERESTS OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19th CENTURY IN CENTRAL ASIA. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology*, 17(7), 8521-8546. Retrieved from <https://archives.palarch.nl/index.php/jae/article/view/3636>