



Conversion of the Phenomenon of Freedom in the Ancient Philosophy

Rakhimdjanova Dilnavoz Sunnatkizi

Faculty of Social Sciences, NUUZ, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The differences and similarities of the views on freedom, we realize through comparative analysis that this term does not freeze in one place over time, but changes with time and space. For this reason, it is necessary to use it in our article. It can be seen from the descriptions of the emergence and development of the concept of freedom in Western European philosophy that considerations of human freedom have permeated every facet of all periods of human history. With the emergence of the concept of individual freedom in Ancient Greece, the ideas of destiny and choice were linked at the starting point.

Historical and anthropological research has always provided us with evidence of our natural "free individual" - a sufficiently rare species and a local phenomenon. It required very specific special conditions for its emergence; and it can survive only if it maintains these conditions. The free individual is no longer a condition of the human race, but a product of history and society.

Keywords: *Philosophy, the idea of freedom, antiquity, freedom of will, person, society, good, God, choice.*

Citation: Sunnatkizi, R. D. (2021). Conversion of the Phenomenon of Freedom in the Ancient Philosophy. *International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies*, 3(6), 17-21.

INTRODUCTION

All developments and changes in the world are taking place on the basis of freedom. Such free acts as researchers thinking freely, scientists creating inventions freely, young people expressing their innovative ideas freely, are changing the world. The phenomenon of freedom itself, however, is historically variable and multivariate. In each new type of society, a new interpretation of freedom is constantly being developed depending on the level of development of culture, science, technology, influential values, ideals and norms present in that society. The changes are not only in the re-representation of the concept of freedom, but also in the reflection of the category of freedom in worldview paradigms, its perception through social subjects. Freedom as a universality of culture can act as a means of coding certain social norms, self-awareness, and access to communication. Therefore, the conceptual formation of the concept of freedom, the study of its historical development is of great importance.

The global urgency of this problem can be explained with the need to justify the variability of freedom that is formed in the legal culture of the information society, the pace of change in various areas of the information society, including law. The human aspect in the context of the development of a new type of civilization associated with the widespread use of information and communication technologies determines the formation of new boundaries and interpretations of freedom, as well as the position of different methodological approaches and perspectives. The cross-sectoral approach to the study of freedom in the information society allows not only to expand the discourse of freedom as a category of legal culture, but also to reveal its specific features, such as the fact that its legal and moral aspects operate together. From a philosophical point of view, this problem has been studied by thinkers of other periods, such as some philosophers and existentialists that worked in the new era. Their work is being studied by modern researchers. The quest to find a solution to this problem continues by both Western researchers and Eastern scholars. It is important to study the attitude of society towards freedom.

METHODOLOGY

When historians of Greek philosophy studied their subjects, in response to the question "What exactly are being studied?" they sometimes fell into an ambiguous situation. On the one hand, they undoubtedly deal with the texts of that period, as well as self-study of ancient Greek philosophy, but it should be noted that ideologically covered, often irresponsible interpretations of Greek philosophy distort their essence (or create them). The methodological devices are simple enough in this situation.

For example, the historical-philosophical process coincides in part with the dates of the lives of this or that philosopher, and the history of philosophy forms a kind of "gallery of heroes" in it. At this point, in relation to such a process, the goal to which the researcher seeks is implied, or the results are called upon to sum up all the historical

philosophical ideas. Such an approach seems to focus on chronological order, but as long as a whole philosophical history is written and the apparent goal and final idea are given, then chronology cannot be primary here, yet it would be more convenient to call such an approach teleological. The general content of the teleological view of this form can be summed up as follows: the ancient philosophers evaluated how the decision, which is reconstructed by modern commentators, corresponds to the interpreter's own ideal.

We decided to dedicate our research work to the issue of freedom based on the ancient times. We explain this problem in accordance with a certain methodological basis, and show that over time, it has undergone a transformation, and that the issue has not lost its relevance to the present, but rather increased interest in finding an answer. In doing so, we studied the historical-philosophical process of ancient times, in the teleological direction, on the basis of a problematic approach, through a logical analysis of the term freedom through a logical and historical component, and through a comparative approach to the ideas of thinkers of that period.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Freedom has always been one of the most controversial concepts, the subject of the study of the humanities, the ideal and goal of philosophy and law. In the development of different civilizations, variant perceptions of the nature and functions of freedom, which can be added as the basic universality of a culture that governs activity, behavior, and attitudes, are involved. In the form of the universality of culture, freedom acquires its theoretical basis and reasoning in philosophy and jurisprudence. At this point, in jurisprudence, it emerges as a category of legal culture.

As the question of freedom in ancient times was revealed during the comparative analysis of the philosophical teachings of that time, it is understood that it is related to human activity and behavior. Freedom, like the universality of culture, emerges as a characteristic of arbitrary and non-arbitrary activity that depends on the choice of the individual, interrelated with legal norms and morals, natural factors, and moral structures. At the level of everyday consciousness and in an environment of ignorance, freedom is actualized in mythological and moral imaginations. In contrast to the theoretical forms, legal norms and legal codes are presented. The discourse of freedom and its thinking as a universal of culture is reflected in the teachings and concepts of ancient thinkers.

The first chapter of our monograph is devoted to the use of a particular methodological system in fully disclosing the issue of freedom. The holistic view of the monograph is based on this structure. Its chronological sequence went in a straight line. Its succession is considered among the representatives of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Neoplatonism. At this point, it is revealed that the views of each of them gradually changed over time and acquired a new look. At the same time, of course, the divergence style is clearly visible. As we study the views of philosophers on freedom, we make comparisons using comparative analysis. This analysis helps us understand their strengths and weaknesses. Through a teleological approach, we connect the theme of freedom with the spirit of the present. Through this, it is proved that the phenomenon of freedom was transformed not only in the ancient times but also up to our time.

The systematic methodology shows that this term of freedom has not lost its essence at all, no matter how much it has been transformed in society and human life.

When studying the term freedom, it is impossible not to analyze its place in the classical Greek philosophy of antiquity. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the issue of freedom in the dynamics of the views of three major figures, namely, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. An extensive analysis and interpretation of these views is fully disclosed in our second chapter. And we draw brief conclusions from them.

It can be said that Socrates was one of the first in the development of classical Greek philosophy to focus on the unbroken moral and political, collective and individual unity in freedom, its creative character and its relation to choice. From the position of analysis of what Socrates said, it is impossible to understand freedom without moral choice and adherence to ethical norms. In fact, as long as people have a mindset that reflects their moral imagination, it helps in the choice between good and evil. When man is in a state of choice, according to Socrates, he is always embodied as an active, conscious being. That is why it is confronted with possible alternatives. And the choice he makes is based on responsibility and ethical evaluation. "Those who go astray in the choice between good and evil have not understood the responsibility enough and have acted erroneously" [1].

Plato, a student of Socrates, interprets freedom in the form of "eidos" in an ideal state. Only in the absence of social elevators and the legalization of the division of citizens into levels in such a model of society constitutes a sphere of activity within the strict guidelines of freedom. Because "excessive freedom becomes slavery for the state" [2]. However, the need to comply with state laws that combine individual responsibility for the position of Plato and the existence of any options of choice is recognized. According to Plato, the predicted "state that has no rule of law and is under someone's authority will face a crisis. Where the law rules over the ruler, and they are his subjects, I see the redemption

of all the blessings that the state and the gods can give to the state" [3]. In particular, the law is "the only true representative of freedom" [4]. It raises the question not only of the existence of freedom, but also of whether it is necessary for the individual, how its existence is connected with the need to obey the law and the primacy of the interests of the state. Recognizing the dominance of commonality in relation to privacy, Plato concludes that following laws and following traditions exaggerates freedom, impedes the service of state interests, and encourages rebellion and disobedience. The notion of "freedom" is a state-specific quality, a special right of the ideal model of state structure, not of the individual.

Another approach to freedom is found in the work of Aristotle. Seeing freedom as a characteristic of behavior, Aristotle sees it as arbitrary and virtuous. All types of activities are divided into arbitrary and non-arbitrary. For the former, it is inherent to follow the established rules, norms and factors of nature and social order, or they are carried out in the form of ignorance of the consequences, that is, in the form of ignorance. Reasonableness and Relevance are necessary for independent activity, because they are consciously actualized anyway. In such a view, freedom of choice emerges in human activity, which selects the goals and means of activities and actions with the help of reason and knowledge. Arbitrary actions thus reflect a certain freedom and understanding. This in turn creates a sense of responsibility for their actions.

As a logical continuation of the ideas expressed in the previous paragraphs, the philosophical ideas of Neoplatonism are of particular importance with their new-looking approach. Neoplatonists have identified a gradually descending hierarchical hierarchy of primordial beginnings - the One, the Mind of the Universe, the Spirit of the Universe, the Universe (nature) and matter. As we can see, at the very beginning of this stage, the One or Divine first beginning, who has the brightest light, is decided, and everything in the universe is the result of the evolution (emanation) of the absolute first one. Thus, the final order in which the neoplatonists built the universe is based on the fact that each successive higher essence inevitably leads to a slightly lower essence that follows it.

The purpose of human life is to deny material and then emotional needs in order to rise to the necessary conscious and intellectual satisfaction, and their meaning is to manifest the One Principles in the world around man and to experience a sense of complete union with this world. Thus, the Oneness can be attained not only by man, who is a clearly existing and thinking being on earth, but also by a being who realizes the union of his soul with God through ecstasy. This is also the highest condition that anyone can achieve in their normal life.

There is no contradiction between the Neoplatonic teachings about the emotional world and the recognition of human freedom on the one hand, and the existence of various forms of "coercion" of the soul, such as Profession, Destiny, Necessity, Coincidence, and so on. According to the re-created approach of the Neoplatonists, something can limit the freedom of the "individual soul" in some of the relationships it allows. No being can completely give up his freedom, only non-existent matter is not completely free, and is completely deprived of the ability to move, so nothing can "control" the movement of the "individual soul."

Some combined action of the soul as Mind and Essence ("the highest and freest of all souls"), called the Profession, on the one hand, to provide the souls with the greatest freedom, even by supplementing it with things which the Spirit "is incapable of," on the other hand, it is aimed at reducing the consequences of the evil actions of spirits. It should be noted that due to the imperfection of the soul (as opposed to the Mind), the performance of these actions is not perfect. The freedom of human action in the emotional world is limited by the "necessity" and "coincidence" inherent in this world. But any human being is always capable of "good" and "evil" actions, despite his constant freedom in any relationship.

Any "noble action" (including man's action in the emotional world) is to be given a different freedom as an "example" of the Blessing movement (that is, a little less freedom than the movement of the Blessing, but still retains a certain freedom). On the contrary, evil action is otherwise a restriction of freedom. A person who does good deeds is interested in his own "ascension," which is to "ascend" or "return" to the world of the Mind, if he/she seeks to accomplish them more effectively, and with them inflicts as little inevitable evil as possible. On the contrary, seeing one's own freedom as the cause of one's own suffering, one who seeks to get rid of it falls "down" day by day, losing own freedom. Thus, the soul moves into the body of an animal whose freedom is less than human freedom. No creature is able to completely lose its freedom and thus its hope of "returning".

Thus, the ontology of the Neoplatonists can be interpreted as a hierarchy of "essences" with limited freedom that grows from the beginning to the growth of matter. It is freedom that is the unifying principle at all stages of the Neoplatonic system. All beings at one level or another in the Neoplatonic system are, in some respects, the result of either free movement or free act (free choice). In general, something in the Neoplatonic system exists to the extent that it is free.

In view of the above, freedom embodies a universal culture. At the heart of its essence and function lies the activity and attitude of the regulative behavior of social actors. There are three main stages in the actualization of this universal. In the first stage - everyday consciousness - through this concept they define the boundaries as permissible or possible in activities, attitudes and behaviors. The second - in the legal - stage of theoretical consciousness, as a category of legal culture, defines the norms in which freedom is possible and controlled, and their violation is punishable. The third - the philosophical - stage of theoretical consciousness is a reflection on the previous two stages, and at the same time it manifests itself as a discourse on the basis of culture.

At the level of everyday consciousness in a traditional society, perceptions of freedom are determined by its historically formed dominants of behavior and activity. They can be reflected both in nature and as a social character. In the legal stage of theoretical consciousness in a traditional society, the concept of freedom reflects the specifics of the hierarchy of social relations and social structures formed, strengthening legal norms through a system of legal regulations and codes. At the philosophical stage of theoretical consciousness in traditional society, the concept of freedom is strengthened in the teachings of ancient Eastern, ancient and medieval thinkers.

Therefore, even in our time, it has a special place in our society. Its reflection and protection are often found in the legal documents of each state. In particular, the word "freedom" is used 18 times in the Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan. This term is inextricably linked with the citizen of the state, every person in society. Their protection is enshrined in regulations.

"Democracy in the Republic of Uzbekistan is based on universal principles, according to which a person, that person's life, freedom, honor, dignity and other inalienable rights are the highest value.

Democratic rights and freedoms are protected by the Constitution and laws" (Article 13) [5]. Several other such substances can be cited as examples. It is not difficult to prove that all the parts of freedom mentioned in the Constitution are in line with the views of the thinkers of ancient times.

In Aristotle, the freedom of all actions is arbitrarily determined. Freedom does not have a negative meaning here. It is simply a matter of a person being free to perform every action, and accordingly assuming responsibility only to himself/ herself. The same is true in law. Every citizen is free, but at the same time it is stated that punitive measures will be applied in cases where freedom goes beyond the law. True, the society of ancient times is radically different from the society of today. But the essence of freedom has not changed.

In particular, in the analysis of Plato's philosophical views, we can see how close to reality his ideas about the excess of freedom leading to the destruction of society, based on historical experience up to the present time. Even today, young people equate the notion of freedom with the notion that anyone can do whatever they want. But understanding in this way and acting in this direction leads to the disintegration of society, chaos, disruption of the overall system. It also undermines the moral principles that have been formed over the years. After all, the freedom of each person ends within the limits of the freedom of another person. "Citizens shall not infringe upon the legitimate interests, rights and freedoms of other persons, the state and society in the exercise of their rights and freedoms" (Article 20) [5].

Socrates's connection of freedom with morality gave rise to a specific meaning. Human freedom is related to the pursuit of goodness, which is one of the moral categories, subject to the rules of society. Therefore, the individual is free from own personal, material needs, and the pursuit of perfection is equated with traversing the path to true absolute freedom.

We can see in this information that the views on absolute freedom were well developed by the representatives of Neoplatonism. They again associate freedom with the individual. No one can restrict the freedom of another person. We can express this with another article from the constitution:

"Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person.

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention." (Article 25) [5].

It is difficult to find a place where freedom is tied to society in the teachings of Neoplatonism. But it should be noted that they think of spiritual freedom just like Socrates and Plato. Man loses some freedom in his body. That is, his heart can be free. The needs of the body dim the rays of freedom. It is possible to feel the true feeling of freedom in the way of overcoming the lusts of the body and striving for Unity.

This helps to reveal its true nature, while the above views prevent freedom from being understood in the wrong direction. Incorporating such views into the spirit of the younger generation in our society will expand the ranks of young

people who contribute to the development of society and the state. Such approaches to freedom ensure that its place in the present and in the future is unique. After all, as long as humanity exists, the concept of freedom coexists with it.

CONCLUSION

Here we have witnessed the phenomenon of freedom being transformed several times in the same period. The term has changed into new forms in the valuable views inherited from the great representatives of the philosophy of ancient times.

The concept of "freedom" has changed historically, and the issue of freedom has been resolved differently in each period. If for the primitive man freedom means first of all belonging to his people, and the severance of contact with them means complete death, for man living in an industrial and post-industrial society freedom means domination over his personality, activity, private property, means of production, as well as their ability to create. In short, freedom has a legal and economic meaning. How true was the philosopher V.V.Sokolov, who lived and worked in the last century, when he said that "social reality determines personal consciousness and behavior, and the question of freedom reflects their peculiarities" [6].

Specifically, the issue of freedom is an issue of interest to all thinkers throughout the history of mankind. The problem of global humanity has not lost its relevance even today. This, in turn, is a puzzle that offers the most unexpected solutions.

The importance of this problem is conditioned not only by the peculiarities of the cultural period, but also by its further development. It should be borne in mind that the phenomenon of multifaceted, multi-layered, contradictory freedom is the objective basis of many difficulties in its understanding and comprehension.

REFERENCES

1. Брамбо, Р. С. (2002). *Философы Древней Греции The Philosophers of Greece/Пер. с англ. ЛА Игоревского. М.: Центрполиграф.*
2. Государство, П. (1994). *Собрание сочинений в 4 т. М.: Мысль, 3, 79-420.*
3. П. В. Алексеев, А. В. Панин. М. (2004). *Хрестоматия по философии: учебное пособие / сост..*
4. Платон, Д. (1986). *Пер. с древнегреч./Мысль (АН СССР. Ин-т философии. Филос. наследие). Москва.*
5. O'zbekiston (2019) O'zbekiston Respublikasi Konstitutsiyasi.
6. Соколов, В. В. (1999). *Введение в классическую философию. М.: Изд-во Моск. ун-та.*