

**ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF METAPHYSICS WITH PHYSICS IN THE CREDIT-
MODULE SYSTEM**

Jurakulov Sanjar Zafarjon

Asia International University, basic doctoral student

Anatation: Ignoring the crucial nuance in the use of the concept of metaphysics makes it difficult to answer the question “Does physics come first or metaphysics?” The nuance under consideration is related to the “two-sided” structure of metaphysics. Metaphysics as a science refers to two types of phenomena with the presence of metaphysical principles - those that cannot be included in concepts, closed to interpretation, and those that can be realized through experience. From this point of view, it can be said that every society, regardless of the level of civilization, has some metaphysical principles. However, it is also observed that societies that have metaphysical principles cannot develop metaphysics as a science. In order to develop metaphysics as a science, it is necessary to engage in natural sciences and use the results of natural sciences. In our study, we will try to show the areas that feed metaphysical teachings and the connection between these areas and metaphysical teachings with examples from the history of philosophy.

Keywords: metaphysics, physics, natural sciences, existence, truth.

Login: If we look at the history of philosophy, we see that metaphysical doctrines have always been criticized, and that these criticisms have been put forward by philosophers who have metaphysical doctrines. This fact even requires us to distinguish between metaphysical principles or the basis that makes metaphysics exist - one might call "being" - and metaphysics as a science. The fact that the ruptures that have existed in the history of philosophy - Kant's three criticisms - have not prevented the emergence of metaphysical doctrines after him can be explained by the fact that the ground that created the metaphysical sciences was not the destination of these ruptures. However, with Kant it was confirmed that any metaphysical discipline cannot survive without observing the changes in the natural sciences. 2500 years of philosophical history and even older ancient wisdom tell us that the ground that creates metaphysics is in no way interrupted.

For at no stage in history have people ceased to speculate about existence in general, and in particular about their non-physical aspects. The main problem lies in the nature of this idea. Metaphysical principles are a kind of guarantee of metaphysical doctrines, they do not nourish metaphysical doctrines, they only make them exist. Since the ground that makes metaphysics exist, that is, “existence,” does not nourish metaphysical doctrines, metaphysical doctrines have emerged that are both different and contradictory. If the ground that makes metaphysics exist has nourished metaphysical discourses, then the rejection of any metaphysical doctrine - especially Kant's rejection of classical metaphysics - means the rejection or even the disappearance of the ground that makes metaphysics exist. However, since attempts to deal with metaphysics did not end after Kant, it is understandable that the ground that makes metaphysics exist was not hit by these criticisms.

The nature of the ground in question and the forms of its determination should also be emphasized. Since our study is an analysis of the history of philosophy, we will suffice with showing the existence of such a foundation. It is not for nothing that the early philosophers, as we know from the written history of philosophy, were particularly interested in nature and were

naturalists. The Ionian school can be considered an organization in which scientific thinkers worked together. Similarly, Whitfield makes statements confirming Sarach's findings. Greek science was not empirical, but initially speculative, and from the 6th-5th centuries BC thinkers who were both the first scientists and the first philosophers in the history of thought emerged.

It is therefore very likely that the natural philosophers before Socrates went to Egypt, Persia and Mesopotamia, became acquainted with the scientific developments there, and returned to their own countries. He (Thales) went to Egypt as a merchant, and there he learned geometry, and from Mesopotamia astronomy. The discoveries and other achievements attributed to Thales belonged to the sciences developed in Egypt and Babylon. Similarly, Conford in one of his articles emphasizes that the Greek philosophers enjoyed the sciences that emerged in Egypt and Babylon. Thus, the rise of science means that the mind becomes unbiased and sails on seas of thought that seem strange to minds inclined to the immediate problems of action. The connection between philosophy and natural science in the classical period continued in the modern period in the same way. Although there are differences between classical metaphysics and modern metaphysical approaches, the source on which they are nourished is the sciences of their time. What do we understand by a change in metaphysical approach? With the change in social dynamics, the nature of the search for truth - even if its form remains unchanged - changes, and one of the final results of this change is a change in metaphysical teachings.

The ancients could not achieve what we have proposed, because they lacked scientific ignorance. It is a very optimistic and modern attitude to read the process of transformation/change of metaphysical teachings as the development of the consciousness of being. But in this case, it is useful to consider the point of view of Comte. It can be said that the positive philosophy created by Comte should be considered metaphysical, it was influenced by the developments in the natural sciences and in this direction turned to positive science to explain all phenomena. Comte founded a sociology based on biology. The subject of biology and sociology is the same; the organism and the collective organism. When we move from the inorganic world to the organic world in nature, we encounter new concepts that did not exist before.

Method: Another example of how metaphysical teachings are closely related to the understanding of the science of his time is Galileo. The point to which you need to turn your eyes to determine the goal is the "book of nature". In fact, the main subject of philosophy is to examine the "book of nature". Examples of science providing data for metaphysics can also be seen in analyzing the history of thought. The influence of philosophy on scientific research was not only in the general sphere; individual scientific achievements also influenced and directed philosophical views. However, Plato, who gave his color to classical metaphysics, was convinced that there is a plan and purpose everywhere in nature under the influence of the materialism of the early physicists. It became a common attempt to argue that science is an incorrect means of achieving truth, especially after the criticisms of positivism. In particular, K. Popper, T. Kuhn, I. The criticisms of positivism by Lakatos, P. Feyerabend, and others, while valuable, miss a very basic point. Science is not a finished activity.

Criticism of anything is possible if the framework of that thing is drawn, filled, or encompassed. Let us consider Kant's critique of classical metaphysics. It was clear on what principles classical metaphysics was based, from what logic it proceeded, and to what universe it led. In other words, Kant had clear boundaries and what it encompassed. Does the same apply to science? No, it is not true. Because science is not a finished activity, and what results it will produce cannot be predicted from now on or in the history of science.

Is it the science of existence or the existence of science?

The attempt to understand nature is the first step in man's efforts to comprehend existence. We must remember that scientific theories put forward metaphysical theses before metaphysics. The natural studies of the first philosophers and the knowledge they gained later led to the emergence of metaphysical teachings. First of all, most of those who engaged in philosophy thought that the first basis of all objects was only in the form of matter. The conclusion that follows from this is that metaphysics is impossible without resorting to nature.

Depending on their influence on philosophy, people rise to a level where they stand out from the crowd, some to a greater or lesser degree. The point to which you should turn your eyes to determine the goal is the "book of nature." So why did metaphysicians who enjoyed natural science, including Aristotle, who said that "being has many meanings," assume that the theses they developed represent absolute truth? Could it be that the factor that gives them such a criterion of certainty is their acceptance of the data of natural science as immutable? Aristotle, who used the principle of the 4th cause in his book "Physics" and composed his work "On the Heavens" with the principle of the 4th cause, assumed that there were certain data in the science of physics and astronomy to which he referred. Similarly, is there any classical metaphysician or philosopher who philosophically criticized the natural science, in other words, the philosophy of science? Criticism of the natural sciences is related to the use of science as a political tool and the process of turning science into a tool of exploitation by serving the economy. Therefore, it is difficult to say that science did not have a claim to truth in the classical period. In this respect, it is significant that Aristotle found the solid information he sought in geometry, his firm belief in geometry, and his belief that accurate and reliable information could be obtained in the natural sciences based on this science or by accepting it as such. example. Did Aristotle, when writing the Physics, think that the theses he put forward were not absolute? We all know that there could be no other way.

When things happen that are beyond our observation, we cannot say that they exist or do not exist. Therefore, the object of knowledge is something that is necessary and therefore eternal. Did Aristotle, who argued that scientific knowledge is different from the ideas that we encounter in conjectures, which are disconnected from experience, think that his theses developed in physics could be falsified? If the idea that sciences can change over time and new physical systems can arise had dominated classical thought, the scholastic period would not have arisen in the West and the East. For centuries, it must have been accepted that the data of the natural sciences were immutable and absolute, and therefore it was possible to prove that the metaphysical doctrines derived from these data were firm and absolute. With the innovations in other natural sciences, in particular in classical physics, classical metaphysics lost the ground on which it nourished itself. When it was decided that metaphysics should take into account developments in natural science and be modified accordingly, new metaphysical doctrines were developed. We can evaluate metaphysical approaches that take into account developments in natural science and consider how to reconcile these developments in this direction. Because scientific results give meaning to metaphysics.

Paths of metaphysical research

Several metaphysical approaches that are highly representative in terms of understanding the problem can be considered in this context. For example, Descartes emphasizes that we must take into account the changes/variations in the natural sciences, especially in physics. As for me, I am a little more curious and I would like you to explain the particular difficulties that I have

encountered in each of the sciences, mainly in connection with the inventions, images (...) of men, which are surprising; because I think that knowing these is useful not only to benefit from them, but also so that our judgments are not mistaken in admiring what we do not know. As can be seen from the quote, Descartes emphasizes that sciences and inventions are not only useful, but also necessary for correct reasoning. The logical consequence of this approach was the metaphysical doctrine that arose from the data of natural science.

The world of Cartesia, on the other hand, is a strictly formal mathematical world, a world of realized geometry, about which our clear and precise ideas give us clear and precise knowledge. There is nothing in this world except matter and motion; or since matter is identical with space or extension, there is nothing except extension and motion. The metaphysical doctrine that Descartes developed due to the interaction he perceived can be criticized from various points of view. But the important point is that Descartes understood. The truths that I say are well received even if I do not get them from Aristotle or Plato, Descartes understood that classical metaphysics could not respond to new developments/changes in physics and therefore classical metaphysics was not compatible. the universe drawn by the new physics, which led to the development of metaphysics based on epistemology. The incompatibility of a way of thinking based on being with changes/transformations in the natural sciences made it inevitable for Descartes to develop a way of thinking based on epistemology that could quickly adapt to changes/transformations in the natural sciences.

We know that Descartes wrote to Mersenne that “The Meditations contain all the principles of physics.” His opposition to scholastic logic can also be interpreted in this way. From now on, logic must also be examined; but not scholastic logic, because it is nothing more than dialectics, it serves no purpose other than to teach others the means of explaining certain things or to utter many unfounded words, and it corrupts rather than enhances common sense. It is not logical to say that Descartes’ only option was to develop an epistemologically centered way of thinking. But we must emphasize that Descartes’ decision is not important, his decision is. The search for truth by the light of nature, this pure light, shows all the ideas that a reasonable person can form about everything that occupies his mind without the help of religion and philosophy, and penetrates everything, even the secrets of the strangest things.

Result: The influence of natural sciences on metaphysics also applies to theology, Sufism and Islamic philosophy. The metaphysical scheme described in “Gulshen-i Raz”, one of the important works of the Akbari wing of Sufi metaphysics, was compiled taking into account the astronomical data of Ptolemy. This great sky, this Throne, makes a complete revolution around the universe every day and night ... However, in the following section, the eight heavens rotate from west to east, unlike the sky we call Atlas, which Shebüsteri sees as its existence and is based on the data of Ptolemy astronomy. Ibn Sina's theory of emanation - on the contrary, the metaphysical picture drawn by other scientists arises on the basis of the data of physics, astronomy and natural sciences developed in antiquity.

It is clear that Avicenna's theory of emanation, in its simplest form, is closely related to Ptolemaic cosmology, and Avicenna interprets the "scientific" paradigm originating in Ancient Greece with new insights, but does not go beyond the framework of the paradigm and does not present another view or extension. as well as in the theological works of the contractor on the metaphysical topics of ancient natural sciences; It is widely used in the arguments for God and in the debates on creation. Surprisingly, the word adopted atomistic cosmology and began to dominate in the second half of the 8th century. This cosmology dates back to at least the 14th century. It lasted until this century. The atomic physics of Democritus, considered materialist,

was the physics accepted by theologians. The "atomic universe model" is the dominant universe vision that guided Islamic civilization for more than ten centuries. With the development of natural sciences, the question of how solidly grounded the mentioned bodily unity or emanational metaphysics is becomes important.

The transformation of these classical metaphysical teachings into a matter of faith not only creates intellectual violence in academic life, but also leads to an existential problem: the problem of associating the Qur'an, which is the source of existence and knowledge, with only a certain type of metaphysics. As a natural consequence of this association, a certain type of metaphysics is accepted as the only legitimate and orthodox interpretation of the Qur'an. The idea that the Qur'an, which is taken as the source of existence and knowledge, leads/should lead only to classical metaphysics prevents a proper assessment of the traditions of classical thought. And the issue takes on an ideological aspect rather than a search for truth. The texts of theology, Sufism, and Islamic philosophy contain valuable information for their time, relevant to our time, approaches that can provide solutions to many problems. However, the use of the texts under consideration for ideological purposes, their commodification, in Marxist terminology, prevents them from being given their due place.

Criticism of science and metaphysics

In the present era, in parallel with the intensification of scientific criticism, a process of deification of metaphysics is also observed. If we do not take into account that the source of both classical metaphysics and post-Kantian metaphysics is the natural sciences of their time, and especially physics, the process of deification under consideration becomes "academic domination". The fact that science is constantly undergoing changes/transformations also means that metaphysical doctrines change/transform in each era, and this leads us to the conclusion that there can be no strict metaphysical doctrine. To say that a stable metaphysics is possible means that "truth can be achieved". However, although this is a truth independent of people, at best it can touch this truth. Such a connection allows for the implementation of unlimited translation activities. On the other hand, we should avoid defending Heidegger's theses, such as that the theses about being developed by natural philosophers or the first naturalists are correct, that pre-Socratic philosophy is closer to being, and so on.

For the epistemological exception of the Heideggerian approach seriously jeopardizes the possibility of speaking about being. Its aim was to place being, existence itself, at the center. Thus, the movement of "searching for the foundation" was placed from the epistemological plane to the ontological plane. However, Heidegger must have faced this danger because he was particularly interested in poetry and insisted that we should listen to the call of being. However, at the point where such an approach should reach, poetry should not have a special place. For Heidegger's philosophy still remains in the essence of metaphysics, with poetic themes such as revealing the meaning of being, accepting the taking as a gift and a gift, dividing existence and losing its origin.

Poetic ontology is inevitably situated on the margins of theological discourse. In such a case, the best course of action we can take is to "keep quiet." Therefore, it is difficult to defend Heidegger's conception of being, since it does not take epistemology into account. Even Heidegger himself has put forward theses that contradict this attitude. Since the sciences are human relations, they have the type of being of this being (man). Terminologically, we call the being in question Dasein – it is interesting that when the concept of Dasein, one of the defining concepts of being and time, is first mentioned, its definition is given and its connection with

science is emphasized. Therefore, in order to be able to say that the study of the meaning of being requires us to listen to the voice of being, we must also speak from a certain epistemological basis. Fate, as the sender of truth, remains hidden. But although it is not revealed as a history of Being, the fate of the world is predicted in the poem. The meaning of Being can be given in poetry, but this cannot be ignored, since each poem has a certain epistemological character. We do not necessarily say that each poem is the work of a certain cogito.

Discussion: The metaphysical teachings that exist in today's Western thought make the most of the information discovered by the natural sciences, and the epistemological attitude formed by the natural sciences determines ontology and cosmology. For example, the cosmological discussions of the famous physicists Penrose and Hawking are different from classical metaphysics or classical cosmology. In fact, astronomy, biochemistry, physics, etc. It is formed through the data of the sciences. In current science, cosmology is a science that studies the structure of the universe or the universe, that is, all material components, as opposed to mental and spiritual entities. This research is mainly carried out under the umbrella of (...) physics and astronomy. Penrose, Hawking and others develop a new vision of the universe and a new understanding of existence based on the data discovered by the natural sciences.

According to Hawking and Mlodinow, science, at its current level, can explain, within its limits, such questions as how the universe came into being from nothing and why it has such delicate living conditions. However, all metaphysical teachings try to do exactly as Hawking and Mlodinow say. If we want to delve deeper into the fundamental questions of philosophy, we must truly come to terms with quantum theory, the most precise and mysterious of physical theories. In this sense, it can be said that Hawking, Penrose, Mlodinow and others have their place in the history of philosophy and are a recurring process. A change in the model of the universe also leads to a change in the concept of God. For example, in Europe in the 17th century. The concept of the universe, which changed with the scientific revolution in the 19th century, also led to a change in the concept of God. The fact that classical metaphysicians insisted on the theses they put forward as absolutely correct stems from their confidence in natural science. The inability of natural sciences to provide truth and embody certainty is due to events/developments that have occurred in the history of science over the past few centuries.

The changes that occurred in the natural sciences revealed a critique of science that did not exist in the classical period. Since such changes/transformations did not occur in science in the classical period, there was complete confidence in the natural sciences, and it was claimed that the metaphysical teachings that enjoyed them contained immutable and certain information. Today's metaphysical teachings must also take into account the changes/transformations in the natural sciences. If we want to use philosophical intuitions to our full potential, we must interpret our worldview according to quantum theory. Just as a person cannot abandon the pursuit of science, he cannot abandon the development of metaphysical teachings. Considering Hegel's words in describing philosophy that "Minera's owl begins to fly only at sunset," it can be said that philosophy flies over the changes/transformations that occur in the natural sciences "at noon." Alain Badiou also says the following in this context: "We can begin by considering that the future under consideration is not primarily based on philosophy and the history of philosophy, but on new phenomena in certain fields that are not directly philosophical in nature.

This future is based, in particular, on facts in the field of science: for example, mathematics for Plato, Descartes, or Leibniz; physics for Kant, Whitehead, or Popper; history for Hegel or Marx; biology for Nietzsche, Bergson, or Deleuze.

Conclusion: The concept of metaphysics, which had been dethroned, is being revived. It is said that metaphysics, whether on the continent or in the analytic tradition, has returned to the stage of philosophy, and therefore true thought cannot exist without metaphysics. But the metaphysics that is returning is not the metaphysics that was banished. The prevailing perception in the intellectual life of our country is that classical metaphysics is once again dominating the philosophical scene, or is a candidate for dominating it. This perception is both erroneous and dangerous. Since metaphysical doctrines have been nourished from the very beginning by the natural sciences, today's metaphysical doctrine cannot ignore the concept of post-Copernican science; in fact, it will not. Moreover, the gradual disintegration of traditional ontology under the onslaught of the new philosophy has weakened the validity of inferring from the predicate the substance that supports it. Each development of Newtonian science has brought new evidence to Leibniz's thesis.

The reason why positivist philosophy became popular in the 20th century was that the metaphysics of that time could not reform or change itself in the face of changing/changing concepts of science. The reason why metaphysics, which could not fully realize this change, but was at least on the path to changing it, quickly ousted positivism from the philosophical scene was that metaphysics found a way to feed on modern science. Undoubtedly, metaphysicians saw the results of science and revised their metaphysical theses. What needs to be done is to develop a new metaphysical perspective that takes into account the data of the natural sciences. Because metaphysics is based on science, which is the source of knowledge.

References

1. U. Akkutay, Expert Reports on National Education, Atatürk Era. Ankara: Avni Akyol, Ümit Culture and Education Foundation Publication, No.2.
2. LH Clark, RL Klein, and JB Burks, The American Secondary School Curriculum, 2nd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company.
3. C. Aydogdu, "Determining the Problems encountered in Chemical Laboratory Applications," H.Ü. Journal of the Faculty of Education, no. 15, pp. 30–35.
4. S. Chepni, AR Akdeniz, and A. Ayas, "The Place and Importance of the Laboratory in Science-III," Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi, no. 206, pp. 24–28.
5. Ayas, AR Akdeniz, and S. Chepni, "The Place and Importance of the Laboratory in Science-I," Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi, no. 204, pp. 21–25.
6. YÖK, Eğitim Faculty Teacher Training Undergraduate Programs. Ankara: Yükseköğretim Kurulu.
7. 8. RKYin, Case Study Research: Design and Methods. London: Sage. Y. Cahin, Evaluation of Laboratory Use and Applied Approaches in Some Universities in Turkey, High School Thesis, KTÜ., Trabzon.
9. M. Fullan, The New Meaning of Educational Change, 4th ed. New York: Teachers College Press.
10. J. Biggs and C. Tang, Teaching for Quality Learning at University, 4th ed. Berkshire: Open University Press.
11. OECD, Future of Education and Skills 2030: Curriculum Analysis. Paris: OECD.