

THE IMPORTANCE OF EVOLUTIONARY EPISTEMOLOGY AS A PROCESS

Akida Khurramovna Khaydarova

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Associate Professor National University of
Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)

Abstract: The article examines the significance of evolutionary epistemology as a process of knowledge formation and development. It reveals its philosophical and methodological role in explaining the dynamics of cognition and the interrelation of biological, cognitive, and sociocultural factors in the evolution of knowledge. The study argues that evolutionary epistemology provides a theoretical foundation for understanding the adaptive nature of human thinking, scientific progress, and the transformation of knowledge in contemporary society.

Key words: evolutionary epistemology, process of cognition, knowledge development, cognitive evolution, philosophy of science, methodology of knowledge, scientific thinking, interdisciplinary approach.

ВАЖНОСТЬ ЭВОЛЮЦИОННОЙ ЭПИСТЕМОЛОГИИ КАК ПРОЦЕССА

Хайдарова Акида Хуррамовна

докторант Национального университета Узбекистана имени Мирзо
Улугбека доктор философских наук (PhD), доцент, (Ташкент, Узбекистан)

Аннотация: В статье анализируется важность эволюционной эпистемологии как процесса формирования и развития знания. Раскрывается её философско-методологическое значение в объяснении динамики познания, взаимосвязи биологических, когнитивных и социокультурных факторов в эволюции знания. Обосновывается, что эволюционная эпистемология служит теоретической основой для понимания адаптивного характера мышления, научного прогресса и трансформации научного знания в условиях современной цивилизации.

Ключевые слова: эволюционная эпистемология, процесс познания, развитие знания, когнитивная эволюция, философия науки, методология познания, научное мышление, междисциплинарный подход.

INTRODUCTION.

The development of views on epistemology has undergone many stages, and by the mid-20th century, a split in the development of epistemology had occurred. Evolutionary epistemology can be interpreted as a scientific and methodological paradigm that marks a break with traditional epistemology. Several factors can be listed that caused this break with traditional epistemology, all of which can be explained by the specific components of traditional epistemology. For example, from a rationalist perspective, the basis for understanding a subject is ultimately determined by rational analysis and skepticism, or Cartesian skepticism. The principle of "I think, therefore I exist," expressed by Descartes, also expresses this rational doubt. Although the emphasis on such doubt in the views of rationalists who came after Descartes is not as strong as in Descartes, one can trace the correspondence of his views to Cartesian epistemology regarding the justification of knowledge. The goal set by rationalists - that of finding indisputable foundations for knowledge and ideas - was not fully addressed by

representatives of this school, and ultimately, the problem of blurring the line between rationalism and skepticism arose. The main driving force behind the criticism and appeals put forward by evolutionary epistemology also focused on this delicate issue. How can we obtain a solid and incontestable foundation for our knowledge? Traditional epistemology, in the form of rationalism, failed to lift the veil of skepticism in this regard and provide a sufficient basis for the origin of our cognitive categories.

METHODOLOGY

Another pillar of traditional epistemology is empiricism or experimental naturalism, the fundamental tenet of which we call intuitive information about the external world as the source of the knowing subject's knowledge. For example, John Locke, one of the most prominent representatives of this school, believed that with the advent of man into the world, he proposed understanding his consciousness as a tabula rasa, that is, a blank slate. But even this approach could not rid us of some long-standing questions in the field of epistemology. As an example of one such question, we cite the problem of categories, proposed by David Hume. According to this problem, our knowledge of categories such as causality is practically impossible to explain through our external life experience, through information received from the external world through our senses. Hume believed that these categories, this capacity, or categorical apparatus supposedly do not originate in humans, or, at least, they cannot be explained solely by the data of our external senses. Kant later reflected on this in detail; the philosopher approached this question in a unique way in his transcendental philosophy. Kant also believed that the categorical apparatus is innate and transcends our emotions, hence the choice of the word "transcendental".

In the post-Humean period, Kant's philosophy itself became one of the pillars of traditional epistemology. Kant and his followers believed that innate, objective, and eternally unchanging categories should not only form the basis of our knowledge but also serve, in a sense, as the fundamental foundation for our understanding of the world. Categories serve to sort, validate, and shape our emotional experiences, thereby forming the foundation of our knowledge. This does not mean that they are uniform across individuals, but although they are equally characteristic of all of us, the conscious subject experiences what they perceive through the flashes of these categories throughout their lives, which ultimately form the basis of all human worldview and knowledge. These categories are claimed to be eternal, unaffected by time, and of an unchanging nature. The inability to explain them within the framework of the natural sciences and the lack of an explanation of how they fit into today's epistemological paradigm have also led to the critique of this view by evolutionary epistemology.

RESULTS

According to the traditional epistemological paradigm, it's difficult to find any basic concept for the origin of human knowledge, as well as for the fundamental cognitive structures underlying human knowledge, without resorting to purely philosophical observations or divine teachings to explain their applicability. Examples of this include the epistemological views of Plato and the Platonists in ancient Greek philosophy, the philosophical observations of the Mu'tazilites in medieval Eastern philosophy, and modern rationalists. One of the most central claims of evolutionary epistemology is the desire to remove this problem from the realm of prior knowledge and to assign it the status of a phylogenetic problem, belonging to a later period.

DISCUSSION

Although evolutionism and epistemology are somewhat disparate fields of science, a bridge can be built between them. The paradigm of evolutionary epistemology unites a number of completely independent doctrines in philosophy, biology, and the social sciences, allowing them to be applied as an interdisciplinary system of concepts. This necessitates the development of interdisciplinary concepts such as epistemology and metaphysics, Darwinism, genetics,

ethology, cultural evolution, and philosophy of science, which are used in an interdisciplinary manner.

Evolutionary epistemology offers causal, naturalistic explanations for human mental abilities, the existence of human cognitive structures, and their rational nature. This process can be compared to the bridging of the gap between the natural and the social during the nineteenth century. It explains that abilities such as the ability to perform logical operations and the processing of our observations using scientific methods are important mechanisms that enable us to adapt to the environment. It is argued that these are all natural mechanisms shaped by evolution. It can be further argued that this approach can even provide concrete answers to dilemmas such as the traditional dualism of mind and body.

Another dilemma that prompted evolutionary epistemology to enter the arena was the problem of innate structures, and we see a clear manifestation of this problem in the views of David Hume and Kant. Indeed, the most central question posed by evolutionary epistemology is the contradiction between Hume's and Kant's ideas about the necessity and certainty of knowledge. It is precisely this conflict that subsequently grew and became the most central part of the field's problems. In particular, Hume believed that concepts such as causality or induction cannot be grounded in our pure experiences, that is, by the empirical method. Instead, they are more appropriately called psychological habits, or simply traditions. In this way, Hume reduces necessary knowledge to the level of mere psychological predispositions. Kant, on the other hand, in his Critique of Pure Reason, opposes Hume and calls a priori categories—that is, categories such as space, time, and causality—necessary, universal, and inherent in the human mind. Kant also believes that it is precisely because of them that human experiences of the external world can exist. For this reason, according to Kant, they can be called the conditions for the existence of external experiences.

DISCUSSION

But we can also point out some imbalances in this system. First, these categories are said to be eternal, unchanging, and based on some supernatural foundation. This excludes factors such as change and environmental pressures associated with development and evolution. Second, Kant limits our knowledge to the phenomenal universe—that is, the universe that can be known—and thus writes that the noumenal universe is incomprehensible. This leaves open the question of the compatibility of the universe and the consciousness that perceives it. Evolutionary epistemology, while the research of Conrad Lawrence, can be seen as a solution to this problem, since in Lawrence's theory, the categories presented by Kant as a priori are transformed into a posteriori category from a phylogenetic perspective. In particular, these cognitive structures are a priori for an individual, that is, they are of a genetic nature and are not assimilated during the life of an individual, but a posteriori for the entire species, that is, they are assimilated and formed under environmental pressure during the evolution of the species.

CONCLUSION

The term "proportion," coined by the English scientist E. Wilson, is important for introducing the principles of evolutionary epistemology into philosophy. By this, Wilson implies the need to synthesize information from various fields of science and thus create a common domain of knowledge. Darwin's evolutionary pressure on species extends beyond biological science and is also beginning to be applied in the philosophy of science to explain the evolution of human cognitive abilities. Just as studying an organism in a space independent of its environment is equally misguided and ineffective for a biologist, studying human cognitive abilities independently of the environmental parameters in which the individual, individual, and species reside is equally futile. For this reason, researchers such as Rupert Riddle and Fulmer call for a biologization of epistemology, arguing that the biological parameters of the

environment in which we live give rise to cognitive abilities appropriate to that environment. To express this, Riddle implements the concept of the burden of inherited traits. According to him, the properties acquired by a species as a result of evolution impose restrictions on the cognitive world of a representative of the species throughout its life and determine the direction of the species' further development.

References.

1. Kant Immanuel. Critique of Pure Reason. 1781. P.25.
2. Lorenz Konrad. "Behind the Mirror: A Search for a Natural History of Human Knowledge". New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977. P.56.
3. Edward O. Uilson. Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge. New York, 1998. P.48.