

IMPORTANCE OF ANALYZING THE VIEWS OF WESTERN RESEARCHERS ON THE FAMILY



<https://doi.org/10.24412/2181-1784-2022-23-234-243>

Abdurauf Tolibov Nuriddin ugli

A senior teacher at Tashkent state university of economics

white_tiger@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

In modern social theory, the dominant idea is that the family is constituted by three types of relationships: properties (husband-wife); offspring (parents-children); consanguinity. There are many definitions of the family, reflecting different points of view on the content of these basic relationships.

So, P.A. In “System of Sociology,” Sorokin understands family as a legal union (often for life) of spouses, on the one hand, the union of parents and children, on the other, • the union of relatives and in-laws, on the third [1. 66]. A.I. Antonov, insisting on the indispensable presence of all three types of relations (marriage, parenthood, kinship) to define the family as an institution, and suggests calling other "fragments of the family" "family groups." The main feature of a family in this definition is the presence of both biological parents and children. N. Smelzer, on the contrary, emphasizes that in this case, children may well not be relatives, but adopted [2]. Below it is described definitions of family in a various phase by A.G. Kharchev, E. Giddens, D. Olson and J. Defrain, G.M. Andreeva, T.A. Gurko and so on. Researchers have different thoughts which can make you think clearly.

Key words: *Family, marriage, moral love, de facto marriages, monogamy, "Biologizing", "Evolutionist".*

ВАЖНОСТЬ АНАЛИЗА ВЗГЛЯДОВ ЗАПАДНЫХ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЕЙ НА СЕМЬЮ

АННОТАЦИЯ

В современной социальной теории доминирует представление, что семью конституируют три вида отношений: свойства (муж-жена); порождения (родители-дети); кровного родства. Существует множество определений семьи, отражающих различные точки зрения на содержание этих базовых отношений.

Так, П.А. Сорокин в «Системе социологии» под семьей понимает легальный союз (часто пожизненный) супругов, с одной стороны, союз родителей и детей — с другой, союз родственников и свойственников — с третьей. Его позицию разделяет А.И. Антонов, настаивая на обязательном наличии всех трех видов отношений (супружества, родительства, родства) для определения семьи как института и предлагает прочие «осколки семьи» именовать «семейными группами». Главный признак семьи в этом определении - наличие обоих биологических родителей и детей. Н. Смелзер, наоборот, подчеркивает, что при этом дети вполне могут быть не родными, а усыновленными. Ниже описаны определения семьи в различных фазах А.Г. Харчевым, Э. Гидденсом, Д. Олсоном и Дж. Дефреном, Г.М. Андреева, Т.А. Гурко и так далее. У исследователей есть разные мысли, которые могут заставить вас думать долго.

Ключевые слова: *Семья, брак, моральная любовь, de facto браки, моногамия, “Биологизация”, “Эволюционист”.*

INTRODUCTION

In our opinion, the most complete definition; the emphasis on the inextricable connection of the family as an institution and as a small group was given by the sociologist A.G. Kharchev: “The family can be defined as a historically-specific system of relationships between spouses, between parents and children, as a small social group, whose members are connected by marriage or parental relations, community of life and mutual moral responsibility, and social necessity, which is due to the need of society in the physical and spiritual reproduction of the population” [3. 75]. It is clear that such a definition is rather an ideal model of a family than a statement of its real existence.

If we assume that the family is based on a legally formalized (often lifelong) union of a man and a woman, created for the purpose of giving birth and raising children, then the category of families does not include spouses who are legally married without children, persons who are in a civil marriage and have a common child, single parents with children, elderly spouses with adult children living separately, and other groups of people.

Therefore, a number of scientists are inclined to consider "the family as a set of individuals, consisting in at least one of three types of relationships: consanguinity, procreation, property. [4. 93]" Thus, the English sociologist E. Giddens defines a family as a social unit consisting of people who support each other in one or several

ways, for example, socially, economically or psychologically (love, care, affection) [5].

American scientists D. Olson and J. Defrain define a family as "two or more people who make commitments to each other and who share intimacy, resources, decision-making and values. [6. 78]"

Obviously, such definitions imply a variety of types of relationships and are based more on family identity, and not on objective indicators. That is, "family" from a subjective point of view means those people whom the person himself includes in it, meaning that this is "my family"; It is not necessarily based on marriage, does not necessarily imply children or relatives living in the same household.

Thus, even “objective” scientific ideas about what counts as a family differ. Therefore, according to T.A. Gurko, the answer to the question of what a family is, can consist either in narrowing the scope of the concept (for example, to consider a family only those communities where there are dependent members - minors, disabled or elderly people), or in distinguishing different types of families as a special kind of small groups [7. 95-99].

The modern family as a form of personal life is based on marriage. It is the union of a man and a woman, based on historically diverse socially approved patterns of behavior, with the help of which the family is created.

Love alone, even "moral" love, would not be enough to keep a family in marriage. In principle, love without marriage is a kind of reserve for retreat, in such love there are already elements of calculation, which means that it is no longer love. Marriage is more than just love for one another. It is not only something personal: it is a position that obliges, it is service. “Marriage ... is legal moral love; thereby excluding everything that is transitory, mood-dependent and simply subjective” [8. 192].

An important aspect of marriage: it fixes the family as a whole, separates a husband-wife pair from a man-woman pair (for example, as cohabitants). In the latter case, the main thing is the satisfaction of sexual needs without the functions or obligations imposed by marriage.

Cohabitation and family are completely different forms of relationships with directly opposite consequences for society. Cohabitation is a return to the era of savagery, i.e. a leap back through civilization and even into the era of barbarism. Temporary unions, the so-called "de facto marriages", mean the following: I will be with you as long as you interest me or satisfy me. When you stop, go your own way, and I will go mine. It is clear that there is no human love here, but only naked

eroticism; there is no respect, only selfishness; there is no selfless dedication and willingness to help, but only the reduction of the individual to a utilitarian object that is "thrown away after use" [9].

Any marriage is an agreement between a married couple and her relatives, for marriage is a solution to the universal problem of human society - the problem of keeping the disabled.

"The family is a complex and ambiguous social institution that satisfies personal and family needs in form, but generally social in essence," therefore, in any society, the family simultaneously plays the role of both a social institution and a small group of "natural" origin, which has its own patterns of functioning and development ... Hence its dependence on the social system, existing economic, political, religious relations and * at the same time - relative independence. However, in addition to this, the family is a special ethnic community and economic organization [10].

METHODS

The family as a social institution is an integral system with relative independence. She is an independent open subject of social being, within which the social being of a person is best realized. Consequently, the family is a social institution that is closest to a person.

The systematic nature of the institution-family - in the organized interaction of the subjects of family life in the name of "fulfilling" a special role in society. The social essence of the family is expressed in the existence of a stable set of intersubjective relations in the process of joint activities to meet the needs of society in the reproduction of labor, reproduction and socialization.

According to G.M. Andreeva, a "small social group" is a formation that is not numerous in composition, the members of which are united by common social activities and are in direct personal communication, which is the basis for the emergence of emotional relations, group norms and group processes. As a small group, the family is considered in cases where the relationship between the individuals that make up the family is investigated. This approach allows us to establish the dynamics of marital relations, the nature of the relationship between parents and children, the motives and reasons for divorce.

The distinctive features of the family as a small group of society are as follows:

1) the family is a special kind of union between spouses, characterized by a spiritual community, deep intimate and trusting ties;

2) the family is dominated by a relationship of trust between spouses and children;

3) the peculiarity of the family is manifested in the way of its formation: people marry on the basis of mutual sympathy, spiritual closeness.

The numerous functions that the family performs can be divided into specific - arising from its essence and reflecting its features as a social phenomenon - and nonspecific (those to which the family was forced or adapted in certain historical circumstances).

The specific functions of the family include the birth, maintenance and upbringing of children. The reproductive function performs two tasks: social - biological reproduction of the population, and individual - meeting the need for children. These functions remain with all changes in society, although the nature of the relationship between family and society may vary over the course of history.

The non-specific functions of the family are associated with the accumulation and transfer of property, status, the organization of production and consumption, household, recreation and leisure, taking care of the health and well-being of family members, creating a microclimate that helps relieve stress and self-preservation of the Self, satisfaction of emotional needs (the family provides a sense of security and confidence), support; (help based on love and mutual respect between spouses, as well as between them and children), control over the behavior of its members, especially young ones (the family also controls sexual behavior), the transmission of traditions and cultural heritage, etc.

All these functions reflect the historical nature of the relationship between the family and society, reveal a changing picture of how exactly the birth, maintenance and upbringing of children in the family takes place. Therefore, family changes; most clearly manifested in comparison; of nonspecific functions at different historical stages: under new conditions they are modified, narrowed, or expanded, carried out in full or in part, or even disappear altogether.

The Russian social demographer S. Rapoport added another teleological function to the functions of the family: “The purpose of the family? as a subsystem consists of: what for any- changes in the entire social? system it must: serve as a stabilizing. the center of society, reproducing the main component of any development - a person - in his main enduring characteristics" [12. 98].

In the "family, the most important existential needs of a person are satisfied, first of all - the need for love and belonging. In a family, a person feels the value of his life, finds selfless self-giving, a willingness to sacrifice in the name of the life of

loved ones; Consciousness that a person is needed and dear to someone. loving him and willing to give his life for him creates a sense of security and safety, maintains morale and confidence.

By the beginning of the 20th century. social institutions take on functions that previously belonged to the family. Moreover, we are talking not only about education and upbringing (they are more and more carried out by kindergarten and school), protection and protection (this is done by the police, the army), the functions of food, clothing, leisure (which have become the diocese of the service sector), the transfer of social status (it is provided by industrial hired labor), but also about the specific functions of the family, such as primary socialization or satisfaction of the basic needs of individuals.

Some scholars see this as the cause of the crisis in the institution of the modern family, but before moving on to the present and his. problems in the sphere of the family, it is worth finding out how it arose and along what trajectory it developed.

RESULTS

The family is one of the most ancient forms of social community of people, earlier than the state and even more so the nation. It was the family that became the first social system based on the natural division of labor between husband and wife, parents and children.

The answer to the question about the origin and development of the family is presented in the form of two opposite approaches. First; "Biologizing", which brought together such thinkers as Plato, Aristotle, J.J. Rousseau, J.A. Condorcet, K. Starke, A. Westermarck and others, as well as many religious apologists, defends the eternity of the existence of a patriarchal form of family relations.

Supporters of the second, "evolutionist" approach - I.Ya. Bachofen, J. McLennan, M.M. Kovalevsky, Y. Lippert, J. Lebbcock, L. Morgan, F. Engels, P.A. Sorokin, Yu.I. Semenov and others, on the contrary, are confident in the variability of the forms of marriage and family and argue that evolution consisted in the transition from group marriage to individual marriage.

It seems that the evolutionary approach to the study of the family as a social institution that changes its forms in the course of history, but retains its specific essence, is more fruitful than the biologic approach, which asserts the eternity and "naturalness" of the individual patriarchal family.

However, the idea of "progressive" change in the family, the tendency to interpret development from the past to the future as a positive change in one direction, causes discussion.

So, for example, L. Morgan, and after him and F. Engels asserted that the family is an active principle; it never remains unchanged, but passes from a lower form to a higher one, as society progresses.

So, let's try to schematically outline the main forms-stages of the emergence and evolution of the family, adhering to the logic proposed by F. Engels, according to which the history of the development of this social institution is a reflection of the evolution of social relations and forms of production [12].

F. Engels developed the Marxist view of the family, using the scientific achievements of L. Morgan, who was the first to discover that the earliest social unit was a group, not a man-woman pair. He believed that such a group was exogamous and matriarchal, where kinship and offspring were determined by the maternal line.

F. Engels connected the stages in the development of the family with changes in the mode of production in society and spoke of three forms of marriage, corresponding to three stages in the development of human society.

The period of savagery corresponded to group marriage, the period of barbarism corresponded to pair marriage, and civilized society corresponded to monogamy with accompanying prostitution and adultery. The development from the lower stages to the higher is marked by one feature, namely, that a woman, but not a man at all, is increasingly deprived of the sexual freedom of group marriage, as well as economic independence.

For the early period of development of human society, when there were no separate, isolated family groups and family life was identical to the public one, promiscuity was characteristic (disorderly communication of the sexes, where the relationship was carried out along the maternal line).

However, not all evolutionists, let alone religious thinkers and public figures, accept the hypothesis that at the dawn of human society there were unlimited sexual relations between all members of society (for example, E. Westermarck, K. Starke, M. Kovalevsky). So, M. Kovalevsky, in his work "Essay on the Origin and Development of Family and Property", argued that maternal kinship and exogamy necessarily presuppose the regulation and organization of sexual relations, subordinate at the primitive stage to the preservation and reproduction of generations.

DISCUSSIONS

One cannot but agree with A.B. Lyubimova is that "the development of the family in the primitive era consisted in a continuous narrowing of the circle of persons from which you can choose a marriage partner." Thus, unrestricted sexual relations gave way to a consanguineous family, which was characterized by group marriage (i.e., marriage not between individuals, but between their groups), but sexual intercourse in it was allowed only between those who belonged to the same generation, thus, brothers and sisters, regardless of the degree of their relationship, formed one "family". The next restriction in the field of sexual relations was the prohibition on their implementation between sisters and brothers.

In the eyes of a significant number of researchers, agamia acts as a ban on marriages within the clan. In fact, it represents the prohibition of all sexual relations in general between members of the genus, equally both marital and extramarital.

Therefore, according to Yu.I. Semenov, it would be more accurate to talk not about agamia, but about akoitia (from the Greek. A - not, coitus - sexual intercourse). Akkoit prohibition in pre-class societies was the main rule that governed relations between the sexes. Violation of the akoitny prohibition is regarded by society not just as a moral offense, but as the most terrible of all possible crimes. The usual punishment for violating agamia was death [13. 209-235].

The historical formation of the family as a separate, special institution begins with its isolation from society, separation into an independent form of being. Therefore, group marriage is replaced by a marriage between individual couples and a pairing family based on it. She was distinguished from monogamous by easy dissolution, fragility, tolerant attitude towards premarital and extramarital affairs.

According to F. Engels, the coupled family did not yet represent a special economic unit, a unit of property, was not separated from the collective household, and therefore was a union of two parties, equal in economic and other respects.

The accumulation of wealth in the hands of individuals and the formation of private property required further strengthening of family relations and, ultimately, the transformation of the paired family into a monogamous one. But the elementary family, according to F. Engels, could not immediately turn into an independent economic unit.

The initial cell of private property could only be a more or less large entity - a patriarchal family - an organization of a certain number of individuals, free and not free, organized into a family subordinate to the paternal authority.

F. Engels is sure that this is an intermediate form of the family in the transition from paired marriage to monogamy, which arose at the border between the middle

and highest stage of barbarism; its final victory was one of the signs of the arrival of the era of civilization.

Yu.I. Semenov quite rightly proposed to designate a family based on both monogamy and polygamy (polygyny) as a "patriarchal" family, leaving for the patriarchal family its long-established meaning - "the unification of several elementary families, the heads of which are related in the male line [14. 235]".

CONCLUSION

As can be seen from the analysis of the socio-philosophical heritage, the study of the family, the views of researchers who addressed the problem of the family largely coincide regarding the universality, universality and consistency of family life. However, the basis of this phenomenon is seen in different ways: from the sacralization of the family to its interpretation as a physical necessity.

Altruism or "self-transcendence" is the main idea of socio-philosophical views on the family (both religious and secular). The family is the place where we learn to interact with others, build relationships with them and love them; family is a school of love.

In our opinion, the family as a social institution is largely based on spiritual and value foundations. Ignoring these grounds, replacing them with social expediency, utilitarian rationality can lead to destructive phenomena in the family and in society as a whole. Which is what is happening now.

REFERENCES

1. Antonov A.I., Medkov V.M. Sociology of the family. M.: MSU, 1996. S. 66.
2. See: Smelzer N. Sociology. M.: Phoenix, 1998.
3. Kharchev A.G. Marriage and family in the USSR. M.: Thought, 1979. S. 75.
4. See, for example, Golod S.I. Family and marriage: historical and sociological analysis. St. Petersburg: Petropolis, 1998, p. 93.
5. See: Giddens E. Sociology. M.: Editorial URSS, 1999.
6. Quoted. Quoted from: Solodnikov V.V. Socially maladapted family in modern society. Ryazan: Press, 2001, p. 78.
7. See: Gurko T.A. Transformation of the institution of the modern family // Sociological research. - 1995. - No. 10. S. 95-99.
8. Hegel G.W.F. Compositions in 14 years. T. 7. S. 192.
9. See: Valverde K. Philosophical Anthropology. St. Petersburg: Christian Russia, 2000.

10. See: Carlson A. Society - Family - Personality: America's Social Crisis. Alternative sociological approach / Per. from English. M.: Grail, 2003.
11. Rapoport S. Family as a subsystem of social development of a territorial community//Sociological study of demography, family and health issues. Vilnius: Institute of Philosophy, Sociology. and rights of the Academy of Sciences of the Lithuanian SSR, 1987, p. 98.
12. See: Engels F. The origin of the family, private property and the state // Marx K., Engels F Soch. 2nd ed. T. 21. M. - Gospolitizdat, 1961
13. See: Semenov Yu.I. Social organization of relations between the sexes: Origin and development // Social Philosophy. Lecture course. Textbook. - Ed. I.A. Gobozova. - M.: Publisher Savin S.A., 2003. - S. 209-235.
14. Semenov Yu.I. Origin of marriage and family. M.: Thought, 1979. S. 253.