

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 04 Volume: 84

Published: 21.04.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Denis Bakhtiyorovich Sadullaev

Bukhara State Medical Institute

English chair,

duncan.sllv.1992@gmail.com

HISTORICAL REALITY CONCEPTS

Abstract: The article reveals the content and defines the scope of the concept of “historical reality”, which is used in historical science, philosophy of history and ontological studies of the existence of mankind in time. The idea that this concept, implying the development of mankind as a single organic whole, is single in its volume is substantiated. The scientific novelty of the research lies in the application of formal logic to characterize this ultimate philosophical concept.

Key words: historical reality; content of the concept; ontology; being; time; essence.

Language: English

Citation: Sadullaev, D. B. (2020). Historical reality concepts. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (84), 414-419.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-84-72> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.04.84.72>
Scopus ASCC: 1202.

Introduction

Historical reality is the world of people and their creations. If we list the main features of the human world, that is, deductively reveal the meanings hidden in this laconic definition, we can get a more detailed definition - a complex, but convenient for working, detailed articulation of the content of this concept. Historical reality is humanity, existing and changing, developing in time, as a special spiritual and physical world of life together and the activities of people, in the totality of specific conditions and facts of its existence. This definition is the result of reflection, the problem of which was an attempt to understand what we are talking about when we talk about historical reality. Defining this concept with precisely these meanings, we proceed from the fact that “reality” is that which is, something that actually exists (in the most general sense, everything that exists), and “history is the being of humanity in time” [13, p. 59, 70]. In this definition, the term “humanity” means reality, that is, that which exists, that which is being discussed, and the rest of the words reveal signs or properties - characteristics of the existence of mankind, that is, criteria for the historicity of this reality.

In everyday thinking, in the mass consciousness, this is an indefinite concept with an unclear content and fuzzy volume, because it can be attributed to an

indefinitely large number of signs, and each person in his own way understands the essence of the historical and the meaning of the word “reality”. The certainty of this concept can be achieved by defining the meanings of its two terms and by agreeing on what it is applied to. Good questions that should be asked when drawing up its logical characteristics: how the content and scope of a concept can be determined and how they should be determined, by what methods and procedures, but at the same time so as not to be random and arbitrary, but logically valid, universal and necessary.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In formal logic, “a concept is considered defined when it has a clear content and a clear volume”, while “the content of a concept is the most important signs of the object that it expresses, and volume is the number of objects covered by it” [4, p. 20]. Work on the logical characterization of the concept of “historical reality” shows that the certainty of this concept depends on the concept within which this concept is used. According to idealistic concepts, historical reality is, first of all, spiritual reality, in which the spirit develops in time, accumulating and processing all its past experiences and conditions as the cumulative experience and knowledge of all mankind. Spirit exists and acts primarily as a human

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

mind. Such an interpretation of the historical we have in the writings of Hegel, Berdyaev, Croce, Kollingwood, Rickert, Dilthey and other thinkers [2; 3; 8;9; 12]. Idealistic concepts justified such characteristics of the historical as spirituality (rationality), the reduction of the historical to the human, for only man has reason. So, Hegel wrote that “reason is a substance” and “reason rules and rules the world” [3, p. 486, 491]. Accordingly, world history is a work of creative mind, “world history takes place in the spiritual sphere” and, in essence, it is “the development of the mind-consciousness of its freedom” [Ibid., P. 492, 535]. Hegel interpreted the correlation of natural and spiritual as follows: “the world embraces the physical and mental nature; physical nature also plays a role in world history ... But the spirit and the course of its development are substantial” [Ibid., p. 492]. A concrete expression of the spirit of the people is the state, which is “the form that is the full realization of the spirit in being” [Ibid.]. From this, a conclusion was drawn about the “prehistoric” past of the peoples that had elapsed before the creation of states — this past was carried beyond the bounds of history. “What precedes state life is prehistoric,” wrote Hegel [Ibid., P. 577]. The general thought expressing Hegel's concept was the statement that “world history is generally a manifestation of the spirit in time” [Ibid., P. 543].

The materialist understanding of history, developed in the teachings of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and their followers, presents history as a natural-historical process, part of the development of the natural world, the basis of which is the production of material goods to satisfy human needs [15, p. 19]. Marx and Engels wrote that “this understanding of history is based on the material production of direct life, to consider the actual process of production and to understand the form of communication associated with this mode of production - that is, civil society at its various levels - as the basis of all history; then it is necessary to depict the activities of civil society in the field of public life, and also to explain from it all the various theoretical products and forms of consciousness, religion, philosophy, morality, etc.” [10, p. 418]. The ontological prerequisite for such an understanding was the thesis that “consciousness can never be anything other than conscious being, and the being of people is the real process of their life” [Ibid., P. 402]. From this it was dogmatically, arbitrarily inferred that “consciousness does not determine life, but life determines consciousness” [Ibid., P. 403]. “This understanding of history ... does not explain practice from ideas, but explains ideological formations from material practice” [Ibid., P. 418]. Thus, we see that, denying the substantiality of spirit (consciousness), the materialistic concept of the historical process does not reject spirituality (rationality) and, therefore, humanity and sociality as characteristics of the historical, but, showing the

dependence of consciousness on nature, also considers them as the most important components and signs of the historical world.

Marx and Engels believed that man and nature are not two “things” that are separate from each other and cannot be considered opposites; ““The unity of man with nature” has always taken place in industry” [Ibid., P. 426]. “We know only one single science, the science of history. History can be viewed from two sides, it can be divided into the history of nature and the history of people. However, both of these parties are inextricably linked; as long as people exist, the history of nature and the history of people mutually determine each other” [Ibid., p. 391-392]. Some kind of habitual duality in understanding the essence of the historical is present in the works of the classics of Marxism. On the one hand, in the broad sense of the word, history means the process of movement in time, the process of change and formation, passing through various qualitative stages. For example, Engels writes: “And animals have a history, namely the history of their origin and gradual development to their current state” [15, p. 18]. From these words it follows that Engels considered volatility and development of the essential characteristics of historicity. According to this understanding, everything that does not change and does not develop is not historical. Everything that changes and abides in becoming is historical, and, so to speak, as material nature develops, it also belongs to the world of history. On the other hand, Marx and Engels narrow the historical world to the development of human society, which we see in passages such as “together with man we enter the field of history” [Ibid.], “Civil society is the true center and arena of history” [10, p. 416], “History is nothing but a successive change of individual generations” [Ibid., P. 428].

ANALYSIS

Analysis of existing concepts (both articulated quite clearly in different versions of the ontological philosophy of history, and often implicit, implied in the sciences about culture and serving as the basis of scientific works on history) allows us to distinguish such general and gradually established in modern culture signs, criteria of historicity, such as humanity (correlation with a person, a person is a central element, an atom of history; the world of history is the world of man), sociality (history does not study a lonely person, but the diverse phenomena of people's life together, their connections and relationships), spirituality (certainty, constitutionality by consciousness, reason, ideas; immateriality of a number of components of this real notion), variability (processuality, formation, development), temporality, concreteness, individuality and belonging to the past. This well-established set of signs of historicity (or historical) can be obtained by referring to texts in which the word “history” is present - to historical

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHH (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

works, scientific works on history, sociology and cultural theory, as well as works on epistemology and ontological philosophy of history and agreed to call its existence history, then historicity for us is determined by all that is characteristic of a joint life of people. From here rationality, spirituality, freedom, variability, development and temporality are deduced. Concreteness and individuality are characteristics of historicity based on the initial meanings of the word history in the sense of “information” about something: information must be specific so as not to confuse this object during “inquiry” with another object of this kind. Taking into account the scientifically obtained characteristics of the object and the conventional use of its name, we understand why we now use the phrase “historical reality” to denote the world of people and have the right to use this concept not as the fruit of an individual arbitrary fantasy, understandable only to the author, but as a philosophical concept that exists in the culture of mankind and has the epistemological foundation of universality and necessity.

The attribute of being related to the past as a characteristic of the historical essence is not ontologically correct and requires reservations. Since history is being made in the present with a view to the future, so far the historical exists not only as a human past, but also as a present entering the future, and is thus an organically integral fabric of being in which causal threads of events connect this reality into an organically integrated whole. Therefore, historical does not coincide only with the past and historical is not our past alone, but we constantly live historically. To be historical does not mean to be only the past, because historical events do not occur in the past, but in the present, and they are guided by dreams, goals and plans for the future.

You can see that the meaning of the concept of “historical reality” in many respects coincides with the meaning of the concepts of “social reality” and “society”. These concepts are often rightly used as synonyms. They denote the same object - society in its entirety. The difference in values, apparently, consists in the fact that in the concepts of “social reality”, “society” the static of elements and their interconnections in the world of people is more often thought, moreover, it is thought abstractly from concrete facts, and in the concept of “historical reality” we emphasize the variability of this world, individuality and originality of its constituent elements in all the specifics of their existence. How do concepts come about? Usually we initially empirically perceive homogeneous objects and in contemplation we notice their similarity, the common that is inherent in all of them. So, through consideration of many particular cases of a certain phenomenon, we inductively come to the realization of common features for all these isolated cases and get a general concept, which we give a name. So we make up the concepts of “lightning”, “tree”, “house”, “man”,

“book”, “tool”, “whiteness”, “courage”, “road”, etc. We see these things, notice that some of them are similar to each other, and divide them into groups according to common attributes. But do we come to the concept of historical reality? No.

Firstly, it is not a material thing, secondly, it is not given to us empirically all at once in its entirety, thirdly, it is not one phenomenon in a series of similar phenomena, we do not have a number, since the historical reality in its integrity is a single object, and, fourthly, it is so complex, multi-layered and mobile that it is impossible and inconceivable to have a complete synthetic “photographic” representation about her as an idea of a lemon or an apple. Therefore, the concept of historical reality is not created by the inductive way of comparing and generalizing the data of experience. However, one cannot think that this is a completely a priori concept, arbitrarily coined by an idle mind and not having a referent outside the bounds of pure reason. The joint life of people is an objective fact of world existence, along with the existence of nature, and not someone’s idle fiction [7, p. ten]. The world of people is both spiritual and material at the same time. It is like an ontological crossroads of two worlds - matter and spirit (consciousness with its ideas). Material nature serves as a habitat and object of transformation for the spirit, and the external physical side of human activity is a manifestation and expression of thoughts. These are the physical expressions of our thoughts and relationships that we observe in experience. Empirical intersubjective observation also contains texts - material carriers and spokesmen of the spirit. We have the experience of observing human activities, experiencing historical events and situations, the experience of conversation (direct exchange of thoughts and feelings), cooperation, joint activities, consent and understanding. Therefore, we not only think about historical reality, but also experience it, and when we comprehend it, our mind remains in the reliable field of processing experience data, which makes it possible to avoid arbitrariness and dogmatism in the formation of the concept of it [5, p. 54, 89, 90, 138, 333, 481].

Nevertheless, historical reality is not so much felt by the senses as it is comprehended by reason, since it is “mostly immaterial” [13, p. 72]. Relations of people: friendship, love, camaraderie - this is something immaterial. In addition to physical things and processes, the components that form historical reality are non-material, and therefore invisible thoughts, feelings, values, interests, needs, desires and passions of people, ideas as patterns and projects of activity that govern principles and norms, state laws, human ties and relationships, large and small social groups, public institutions and institutions - all that is called the spirit and its forms in the idealistic concepts of history discussed above. Historical reality is not an isolated thing, like an ax or a pencil, perceived in

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

experience as some single given integrity. Moreover, we do not perceive a number of such holistic objects, with the help of which we could compare, compare and determine what is common to them. L. A. Mikeshina rightly notes that “such social entities as society or economics, capitalism or a nation, language or legislative systems, we cannot observe and sensually perceive their signs and properties - they are not given in the form of “natural units”, Which are perceived by our feelings as similar” [11, p. 219]. The structure that they have, and the order that they form and in which they can be related to each other, are determined not so much by the physical world as by the intelligible meanings of human relations and theoretical constructions. Therefore, the concepts of such objects are formed not by inductive generalization, but otherwise.

DISCUSSION

L. A. Mikeshin, examining the problem of the illogical formation of concepts on the examples of the works of E. Cassirer, F. Hayek, A. Schütz and J. Sörl, notes that often in the humanities and social sciences the concepts were not “deduced” by induction, in a generic way”, but “introduced” by imagination, common sense, intuitive hunch - hypostasis in various forms” [Ibid., p. 216]. So, for example, the concept of “republicanism”, which arose at the beginning of the 18th century on the basis of “tension between the current political situation and the ideal that is possible in the future ... contains an important element - expectation; this concept refers to the future” [Ibid., p. 215], becoming his project. Many other humanitarian and social concepts, such as “communism”, “liberalism”, “democracy”, “patriotism”, “nationalism”, “rule of law”, “justice”, “harmony”, have had and have projective meaning, “Eternal peace”, etc. They do not so much summarize in themselves already present signs of political or economic systems, but express social dreams, aspirations and ideals, regulate thinking and activity, and constitute historical reality. The concepts from the sphere of “practical reason” reflect not what is, but what should be, and are the result of not so much logical procedures of analysis and synthesis as expectations and design.

Using Kantian terminology, we can say that the concept of “historical reality” is not an empirical concept, it is a concept of reason - a synthetic unity of an object, obtained as a result of applying a priori principles of organizing material to existing ones and semantic data [5, p. 128, 129, 130, 282]. Material that expresses not the logical, but the actual volume of the concept of “historical reality” is immensely diverse, complex and large [12]. What images arise in the head when thinking about history? The ruins of the Parthenon and Roman antiquities, Egyptian pyramids and silent steppe mounds, ancient Indian temples, Chinese pagodas and the Great Wall of China, dense

Germanic and Slavic forests and endless steppes of nomads, squares and streets of old cities filled with many-voiced homon, on which unfolded numerous voices dramas of life. There are many examples of such dramas: the wanderings of ancient Jews in the desert and the voyage of Christopher Columbus, the Greco-Persian wars, the campaigns of Alexander the Great, the Roman legions and hordes of Attila, Genghis Khan, Batu and Tamerlane, the great migration of peoples and the inconspicuous daily labor of farmers, shepherds, artisans and factory workers, crusades and popular uprisings, Napoleonic, world, civil and domestic wars, travels, great geographical discoveries and Reformation, the development of the Russian North, Siberia and America, economic and political reforms, scientific, social and cultural revolutions. We contemplate nations, classes, and estates; in this mass of people - peasants in homespun linen shirts and artisans in leather aprons, knights in armor and monks in robes, nobles in silk and furs and naked slaves in chains, poor artists, philosophers, poets and scientists, the bourgeoisie in cars and factory workers. We contemplate an endless string of faces.

The picture of world history is woven from the countless deeds of people, driven by intentions and certain meanings on the endless and diverse natural landscapes in the spiritual atmosphere of various religions, legal and moral norms, in the element of language, which is the “house of being” [14, p. 266]. If we look at the historical ideas in our thoughts, “then we will see a huge picture of changes and actions, infinitely diverse formations of peoples, states, individuals ... a general thought, a category, which first of all appears during this continuous change of individuals and peoples that exist for some time, and then disappear, is a change in general” [3, p. 543-544].

Reviewing all these specific and unique personalities, peoples, acts and events, we organize these objects, distributing them according to such structural subsystems of social reality as the personality system, society and culture, systematize the material according to the spheres of society: economic, political spiritual and social, by geographical location and chronological sequence of existence - by years, periods, eras, eras and centuries, by the methods of production that form socio-economic formations, and local civilizations. The limit to the systematization of all this obscure and heterogeneous material is the concept of historical reality as the most general thought that embraces all this. Introducing this ontologically and logically almost ultimate concept, we organize all the heterogeneous and vast empirical material and basic theoretical knowledge into one object, one construction that can be worked out theoretically and practically [5, p. 125].

In its scope, the concept of “historical reality”, implying the integrity of mankind, is singular, because

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

“humanity” is a singular concept denoting only one object. Just as a person’s hands and feet are parts of his body, and the simultaneous streams of summer rain on Sadova and Tverskaya in Moscow are not different rains, but parts of the same rain, the “historical reality of Russia of the 17th century” or “historical the reality of 18th-century France ”is the essence of a part of one whole, and the relation of these objects is the relation of parts to the whole, and not the logical relation of species to a common genus. This understanding is obtained as a result of the awareness of the unity of mankind on one planet Earth, the integrity and integrity of historical reality, all of whose components ontologically interpenetrate each other. This gives reason to logically qualify the concept of historical reality as a unit in volume.

In carrying out the logical characterization of a concept, it is fundamentally important to take into account in what respect the object is thought. If this is not taken into account, then a violation of the law of identity and a sophisticated confusion of thought are possible, in which we will vaguely think about different things, using the same term [1, p. 213, 215]. You may notice that in one respect the concept of “historical reality” is singular in volume, and in another respect it is general. We can limit it to the introduction of additional features, say, an indication of a place in space or the lifetime of an object. It may turn out that the general generic concept of “historical reality” includes such individual species concepts as the “historical reality of Russia of the 17th century” or the “historical reality of France of the 18th century”, or general species concepts of the type “historical military reality” time (the period of restoration of the national economy, the period of globalization, the Bronze Age or the Hellenistic era). ” But here it is necessary to take into account the fact that in all such concepts, historical reality is conceived not in relation to the whole of humanity as to integrity, but in relation to any part or time of existence with specific conditions of a certain chronological period. In this case, the determination of the subject of judgment occurs by adding those values that were absent in the definition of historical reality as the whole of humanity, existing in time. If we introduce the circumstances of place and time, as well as any

circumstances in general, then we begin to think of historical reality not as humanity, but rather as a specific set of conditions characteristic of the existence of a particular society (people) at a certain time, in a certain place (country), in certain circumstances. In fact, there is a different semantic filling of the concept and a typical case of paralogism with a violation of the law of identity is visible, when, using the same word, we think about different things: there are several objects, and the term is one.

To give an analogy, we give simple examples: the concept of “writer Leo Tolstoy” is a single concept that denotes only one object, but we can think of it as a young and beginner, or as a mature author. Or the “Russian people” as a historical social integrity - this is one object, and the long-suffering or prosperous Russian people denote the various states of this single object, and, in fact, we think here not so much of the people themselves as of their characteristics - the states or situations that they are experiencing. At the same time, the speech stereotype hides the substitution of the meaning of the concept from the mind, and formally we can consider that when we add features that limit the volume of features, we get the kind of concepts that come under the same gender, although in reality we think about different things: substance and -distances, about essence and accidents, that is, about the people, as about the substance and condition in which the people are.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the work on the logical characteristic of the concept of “historical reality” shows that it is a unit in volume concept whose content is determined by such signs, historical criteria as correlation with a person, sociality, spirituality, variability, temporality, development, concreteness and individuality , reference to the past. The synthesis of these signs gives a definition according to which historical reality is humanity, existing and changing, developing in time as a special spiritual and physical world of life together and human activity, in the totality of specific conditions and facts of its existence. The certainty of this concept is a theoretical product of the conceptual approach within which this concept is conceived.

References:

1. (2015). *Aristotle. Metaphysics.* (p.448). Moscow: Eksmo.
2. Berdyaev, N. A. (1990). *The meaning of history.* (p.174). Moscow: Thought.
3. Hegel, G. (2007). *Phenomenology of the spirit.* The philosophy of history. (p.880). Moscow: Eksmo.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

4. Gusev D. A. (2010). *Logic: textbook. allowance.* Moscow: Moscow Psychological and Social Institute. 376 p.
5. Kant I. (1994). *Works: in 8 vols.* Moscow: Choro. T. 3. 741 p.
6. Klyuchevsky, V. O. (2007). *Aphorisms and thoughts about history: Aphorisms. Historical portraits and essays. Diaries.* (p.480). Moscow: Eksmo.
7. Klyuchevsky, V. O. (2007). *Russian history. Full course of lectures: in 3 kn.* Minsk: Harvest. Book. 1, p.592.
8. Collingwood, R. J. (1980). *The idea of history. Autobiography.* (p.486). Moscow: Nauka.
9. Croce, B. (2008). *Anthology of essays on philosophy.* (p.447). St. Petersburg: Pneuma.
10. Marx, K. (2010). *Economic and philosophical manuscripts of and other early philosophical works.* (p.775). Moscow: Academic Project.
11. Mikeshina, L. A. (2010). *Dialogue of cognitive practices. From the history of epistemology and philosophy of science.* (p.575). Moscow: ROSSPEN.
12. Rickert, G. (1997). *The boundaries of science education concepts. A logical introduction to historical sciences.* (p.533). St. Petersburg: Nauka.
13. Savelyeva, I. M., & Poletaev, A. V. (2003). *Knowledge of the past: theory and history: in 2 volumes of St. Petersburg: Nauka.* T. 1. Construction of the past., p. 632.
14. Heidegger, M. (2007). *Time and Being. Articles and speeches.* (p.622). St. Petersburg: Nauka.