

FREEDOM AND SOCIAL CONTROL IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10077701>

Nishonova Nodirakhon Raimjonovnan

Doctor of philosophy sciences, professor, head of the department "Philosophy and national idea" Tashkent State Technical University, Islam Karimov, Tashkent, University St.,

Dilnoza Baxtiyorovna Elmurotova

PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Biomedical Engineering, Computer Science and Biophysics, Tashkent Medical Academy, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract: *Nowadays, the conflict between freedom of science and social control over it is usually solved by involving both scientists and practitioners in solving issues of science development. When society and public opinion are controlled by such forces, social control also passes into their hands.*

Key words: *research, freedom, intellectual, principle, brilliant perspective, norm, conflict, scientific ideas, public opinion.*

Freedom of research activities, scientists should be given the opportunity to independently choose their problems, to decide on which scientific problems and how the resources intended for the development of science should be spent. Otherwise, the possibilities of science will not be fully used. In response, opponents of the idea of freedom of science put forward the principle of social control over scientific activity. According to them, the scientific community should not turn into a "sect" that considers the development of science only as its internal business.

If scientists are given the right to independently determine the goals and directions of scientific research, they can completely forget about "productive" goals, pursuing "intellectual" goals. In this case, in the hands of scientists, science can become a tool to satisfy their interests at the expense of the treasury. As long as society provides funding for science, it has the right to control the development process of science.

Supporters of this principle believe that science has its own logic of development and that only experts and professional scientists can correctly determine its most important and promising directions, including from the point of view of social utility, and that no one but them is capable of evaluating the possibilities of science and ways of implementing its achievements they emphasize.

That is why they believe that society cannot interfere in the internal affairs of science, people who do not related to science should be excluded from the process of making decisions about the development of science, and scientists should have the right to develop knowledge with the help of social funds, but without outside interference [1-3]. The differentiation of science by itself turns most scientists into narrow specialists. While

they are knowledgeable in their field, they cannot adequately assess social needs and tasks arising in practical life, production, economy and politics. Society, through the mechanism of social order, should direct the efforts of scientists to solve tasks that are particularly important for society from a practical point of view. When providing funds for the development of science, society should have the opportunity to determine what these funds are used. Without social control, it is impossible to ensure that science is useful for society.

Currently, the conflict between the freedom of science and the establishment of social control over it is usually resolved by involving both scientists and practitioners in solving the issues of science development. Often, they jointly solve these issues in collegial bodies, expert panels and advisory councils created for this purpose. However, despite this, the conflict between these principles has not disappeared; it remains a place of conflict between the supporters of these principles in solving concrete issues. At times, this conflict becomes particularly acute when it comes to scientific research that may pose certain risks to people or those conflicts with the moral norms and cultural traditions of society. One of the hotly debated issues today is whether scientists should be completely free to choose the goals and means of research, or whether society should limit this freedom in some way. Some believe that no matter how dangerous or harmful scientific knowledge may seem to us, it is impossible to prevent the process of its development. According to them, it is impossible to stop the desire to expand the knowledge inherent in humanity. Moreover, scientific knowledge cannot be harmful in itself: harm can only come from its malicious use.

Society should stop using knowledge in this way. Another group of scientists believes that the freedom to choose the topics of scientific research should be limited, at least because of their cost. Society cannot allow scientists to spend large sums of public money to satisfy their own interests. But the most important thing is that in science research methods and tools that are against humanity and moral standards should be prohibited, experiments whose consequences threaten the existence of humanity in any way, and may lead to ecological, social, genetic and other types of destruction, should be recognized as unacceptable. Based on general considerations, it is necessary to recognize that scientists cannot (and never have) unlimited freedom of scientific research. Universal cultural, first of all, moral values prevail over the interests of the development of science. In addition, this is especially important for modern science, which gives people powerful tools to influence nature and man himself, which scientists could not even dream of before. The freedom of scientific research cannot be applied to scientific experiments that are dangerous for the existence of humankind, without a doubt. This should not be objectionable to reasonable people, including people of science.

Nevertheless, in most cases it is impossible to predict the results and consequences of basic scientific research. It is difficult to predict both the beneficial and harmful changes that they can make in our lives. For this reason, any research cannot be banned outright. In

each case, this issue should be discussed separately and depending on the situation (for example, changes in the living conditions of society, development of culture, new depending on the circumstances related to the emergence of technical and scientific ideas), one or another of his decisions may be revised. In general, the development processes of modern culture give an opportunity to conclude that the existence and development of science today cannot be imagined without one or another form and norms of regulation of research and scientific activity in general [2-9].

Of course, not all the consequences of a major scientific discovery can be predicted. There may be disagreements and errors in their assessment. The ethical assessment of the goals and methods of scientific research can also be controversial. But this situation does not relieve scientists of the obligation to give such assessments and be socially responsible for them.

The issue of social responsibility of scientists became especially important in connection with the creation of atomic weapons. Now, this issue is raised in every case where scientific advances can cause environmental or other disasters. Currently, the idea of social responsibility of scientists is widely recognized.

In practice, the scientists themselves rarely make decisive decisions regarding important social issues that direct science to one or another task.

Would it be appropriate to build a nuclear power plant or some kind of hydroelectric facility?

Is it worth spending unprecedented funds on the creation of interplanetary spaceships?

Is it worth funding the development of new deadly weapons?

In most cases, those in power decide such issues without consulting scientists and without taking into account their recommendations. Here, the principle of social responsibility of scientists should be an important socio-cultural goal for them. If the decisions taken by the authorities contradict the conscience of scientists, they should refuse to participate in the implementation of such decisions and raise their voice of protest. Otherwise, they will be socially responsible for their participation [9-12].

We mentioned social control over science above. But is social control enough?

After all, there are varieties of social forces, including those that drive science to produce results that can benefit some of humanity and harm others. When such forces control society and public opinion, social control also passes into their hands. In this case, they not only do not hinder the directions of scientific research that are not good for humanity, but they themselves encourage them. The arms race is a prime example of this.

The conclusion from the above is that the social responsibility of scientists should be a factor that complements social control and replaces it when society is unable to establish it, and should become an opposing force when society or any other social force monopolizes it and uses it for inhumane purposes.

REFERENCES:

- 1.Кравец А.С. Идеалы и идолы науки. – Воронеж, 1993. – С 63.
2. Философия и методология науки / Под ред. В.И.Кунцова.– М.,1996.– 493.
- 3.Нишонова Н.Р. Аёллар – мустақкам оила омили // Ўзбекистонда ижтимоий фанлар. Тошкент, 2012. № 1-2. Б.87-90.
4. Нишонова Н.Р. Аёлларнинг акмеологик фаоллиги – мустақкам оила пойдевор // Таълим муамолари. Тошкент, 2012. № 1. Б. 17-19.
5. Нишонова Н.Р. Бошқарувда мулоқотнинг ўрни // Таълим тизимида ижтимоий-гуманитар фанлар. Тошкент, 2012. № 2. Б. 123-126.
6. Нишонова Н.Р. Давлат бошқарув тизими ва хотин-қизларнинг ижтимоий-иқтисодий фаоллиги. // ЎзМУ хабарлари 2012. –№ 4/1.– Б. 152-158.
7. Нишонова Н.Р. Возможности женщин в сфере образования Узбекистана // Теоретический журнал. ISSN 1993-8071.–С.Петербург, 2012. №1 (69). –С.157-160.
8. Нишонова Н.Р. Маҳаллий давлат бошқарувида хотин-қизлар фаолиятининг хусусиятлари // Таълим тизимида ижтимоий-гуманитар фанлар. Тошкент, 2012. №4. Б. 91-96.
9. Нишонова Н.Р. Бугунги ижтимоий-сиёсий фаол аёлнинг портрети // Таълим муамолари. Тошкент, 2013. №3. Б. 5-10.
10. Нишонова Н.Р. Аёлларнинг давлат бошқаруви тизими субъекти сифатидаги ўрни // Ижтимоий фикр. Тошкент, 2013. №1. Б. 131-136.
11. Нишонова Н.Р. Парламентда аёллар салмоғи // Тафаккур. Тошкент, 2013. №2. Б. 84-85.
12. Нишонова Н.Р. Феминизм ва гендер тенглик муаммолари // ЎзМУ хабарлари. Тошкент, 2013. №4. Б. 217-220.