

THE ROLE OF BIOETHICS IN THE HUMAN-SOCIAL SYSTEM

Ibrahimova Dilorom Saloxiddinovna*

*Tashkent State Law University,

Tashkent, UZBEKISTAN

Email id: Ibrakhimova_88@mail.ru

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2022.00110.0

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the parable of the role of bioethics in the human-social system. Trends in the development of bioethics have been studied. Based on the need for biotechnology. The scope of efforts to study the problems of bioethics is also expanding. Because at all stages of its history, humanity has sought a deeper understanding of the essence of this issue. From this perspective, bioethics has a very ancient history. We recall the methodological principle of philosophical anthropology, according to which culture is a way of preserving human nature. Thus, it can be said that medical ethics is an integral part that serves to further define the principles of bioethics. Medical ethics, on the other hand, is enriched with new approaches through a deeper understanding of critical issues from a bioethical perspective.

KEYWORDS: *Bioethics, Culture, Society, Human Factor, Nature, Medical Ethics*

INTRODUCTION

The first question in bioethics is formulated by all its representatives in almost the same way, regardless of the biocentric or anthropocentric approach to research. It is a question of who is morally responsible for human life and health. [1]

The modern position of bioethics in the world is largely comparable to scientific advances. At the same time, its managerial role in society implies the existence of organizations, a certain system of documentation, some kind of training of qualified personnel. These three links form the structural basis of the institutionalization of bioethics. The functional aspect of this process involves the formation of a specific field in terms of social life, in which the regulatory influence of the norms and principles of bioethics is mandatory. [2]

Thus, the impact of bioethics principles and values is much broader, but more attention is paid to it in critical health-related situations. At the same time, medical practice, although directly related to the problems of tissue transplantation, cloning, and genetic engineering, does not always address the issues of life and death. The significance of the issue, however, is that patients are average statistical individuals who may or may not have polysomatic nausea and may or may not be mentally healthy. They can be rich or poor, belonging to different professions, nationalities, age groups and religions. In short, the importance of applying the principles of bioethics in medicine is primarily explained by the universality of this area of knowledge and activity. Because today, as VI Vernadsky rightly points out, "The face of our planet - the biosphere - is undergoing dramatic chemical changes by man, consciously and mostly unconsciously," he writes. -Man is changing the physical and chemical atmosphere of the

land, all its natural waters ... Now we are experiencing new geological evolutionary changes in the biosphere. We are entering the noosphere. " [3]

In the development of modern philosophical thinking, the problems of bioethics are manifested in a unique way. This situation is determined by the impact of science, technology and technological progress. The scope of efforts to study the problems of bioethics is also expanding. Because at all stages of its history, humanity has sought a deeper understanding of the essence of this issue. From this perspective, bioethics has a very ancient history. If we pay attention, we can see ideas and approaches related to bioethics in many religious views as well. The formation of bioethical views has been inextricably linked with medical ethics. That is why most people understand medical ethics when they say bioethics. In our view, the confusion between the concepts of "bioethics" and "medical ethics" can be easily overcome through categorical analysis. The central value of bioethics is life in general (while acknowledging that it is an absolute value), and the central concept of medical ethics is individual life. On top of that, there is another value in medical ethics that equates to life, and that is health. While the question of whether it is ethical to save life without maintaining health is a private matter for bioethics, it is one of the key issues for medical ethics. The subject of spirituality in medicine is the medical worker, and the subject of spirituality in bioethics is everyone. [4]

In this regard, while medical ethics discusses the issue of physician responsibility for patient health, bioethics addresses the issue of individual responsibility for one's own health and the health of others. In medical ethics, by the very nature of the case, although our health depends more to a greater extent than heredity, there are no relevant (environmental ethics) norms for them. Bioethics, on the other hand, includes environmental standards as mandatory standards. Thus, it can be said that medical ethics is an integral part that serves to further define the principles of bioethics. Medical ethics, on the other hand, is enriched with new approaches through a deeper understanding of critical issues from a bioethical perspective. But the essence of modern bioethics is easier to understand from a medical point of view, because it is here that life, death, and health take completely definite forms, and therefore theoretical views can be clearly empirically confirmed or rejected. Moreover, even the main issues in bioethics are directly related to the life and health of an individual in the first place. [5]

The rapid development of technology and technology in and around medicine necessitates a transition from informal regulation of people's attitudes to life as a high value to formal management in the system of social institutions. However, this process can only be successful if the general task - the place and role of bioethics in the cultural system - is defined. At the same time, it is impossible to move to the modeling of some links of culture and cultural complexes without a general cultural analysis. We recall the methodological principle of philosophical anthropology, according to which culture is a way of preserving human nature. The transition to legal governance will be possible only when the issues of ethnic settlement are resolved. In this sense, too, bioethics as one of the ways to preserve human nature through the means of culture needs to define its status more clearly. To do this, it is necessary to determine which natural joints and by what cultural means to preserve them, and what is the mechanism of their preservation. [6]

Bioethics was created to answer questions posed by transhumanists, as well as the challenges of advancing technology in medicine. A. Boyd argues that transhumanism is a field of science

aimed at ensuring the continuity and acceleration of conscious life, that it moves beyond the boundaries of modern human development through science and technology. For them reason, science, progress, and longevity are the core values, while transgumanists continue the traditions of the Enlightenment by relying on the advancement of science and technology. Transgumanists in particular focus on the development of areas such as genetics, nanotechnology, and robotics, and see them as a means of human development. Boyd is also researching whether genetic technology can increase sympathy and altruism in human relationships. According to the author, the representatives of transgumanism actually create the concept of what a person should be, and in the second half of the current century, the boundaries between man and artificial intelligence will probably go unnoticed. These ideas of Boyd are very controversial, and even in these thoughts there seems to be a violation of the boundaries of the human spiritual world. [7]

In the system "Man - Society", it is self-evident that the state has a moral responsibility for human life and health. It should guarantee everyone's chances of survival and the conditions to ensure their health. To some extent, these tasks are performed by all social institutions: production, law enforcement agencies, social structures. However, the state has a social institution - the health care system, which serves only this purpose. [8]

Social and personal morality is experiencing a severe crisis today. There are so many things that people are worried about. These include the rise of crime, social injustice, the disappearance of ideals that have officially served as the basis for morality, and so on. What is clear is that if the social system works inefficiently and ignores the demand for justice and deep meaning, moral education or culture will never rise a single step. [9]

We have come to the conclusion that it is necessary to define the social nature of man, which is determined by a number of circumstances, based on the study of daily practice of human interaction with man. This is primarily due to the tasks of forming a harmoniously developed person, building new social relations. These tasks are embodied in the social and spiritual image of the modern person. The need to correct people's relationships through a moral culture, which is a factor in the development of a rational society, is becoming more and more apparent. Such an approach to the consideration of this problem means, first of all, the understanding that man is a crucial link in the activities of any organization, and neither material and technical conditions nor advanced technology can guarantee success on its own. A person's attitude to work, his interest in the results of his work, his place in society, his sensitivity to various social and political events in the world, constitute the spiritual and social aspects of personal activity. These are necessary for further research, but it is expedient to distinguish the most important of them, that is, those that are crucial in bringing our society out of crisis and implementing a newly created model for building a rational, humane society. [10,11]

In the human-social group system, the responsibility for a person's health and life rests with the group members (and more often with the group leader). In this sense, the family can be an example of such a group. In groups known as work teams, however, such responsibility is relatively less. [12]

In the human-to-human system, there is the phenomenon of mutual responsibility of each person for each person, which is also important for our research. However, if the other party in the interpersonal daily health relationship is the physician and there are some misunderstandings, this situation may be interpreted quite differently. His human responsibility for the life and

health of his partner is a professional duty, strengthened by the responsibilities placed on him by society. Therefore, the idea arises that the only people who are morally responsible for the lives and health of others are the medical staff. This view is to link bioethics to medical ethics, to understand that the two fields are exactly the same. It should be noted that a physician is only professionally responsible for the life and health of the person with whom he or she interacts. In other words, the physician is not morally responsible for the lives and health of those who may be his or her probable patients. [13,14]

The second question is who is responsible for a person's life and health, except for the people with whom he interacts? The answer is very simple - man is responsible for it. However, this simple concept is not understood by many spiritually. Taking care of one's own health and a sense of self-preservation is one thing, and being responsible to others for one's own life and health is something else entirely. This notion, which is the norm of morality, has not yet become a guideline, and the attitude of dependence on one's own health is leading to the emergence of new diseases in practice. In this sense, too, the problem of everyone's responsibility for their own life and health is one of the central problems in bioethics. [15]

In short, it is no longer possible to describe the norms of activity in the new scientific and social conditions in society at the present time. This is due to the trend of more globalization. Globalization involves the integration of scientific knowledge - because there are elements of ticketing in ecology, healthy eating, computerization, terrorism, market relations, ethnic issues and more. Therefore, bioethics is a spiritual paradigm of such a society, although it has different meanings in different structures of global society. [16]

REFERENCES:

1. Tursunkulova ShT. Maternal and child health as a basis for the stability of society. In *Philosophy in the Modern World*. 2017. pp. 194-197.
2. Abdullaev AN. Coevolution Challenge in Society and Nature of Social-Philosophical Analysis. *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*, 2019;1(10):157-160.
3. Tursunkulova ShT. Complicated features and theoretical basis of forming person's esthetic consciousness. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 2021;5(97):178-183.
4. Abdullaev AN. The Role of the National Traditions and Rites In Family Upbringing. *Modern Science*, 2017;(4-2);6-8.
5. Tursunkulova ST. Philosophical problems of women's social activity today. *Scientific-methodical and theoretical journal*, 2014;35.
6. Karimova Vasila V. The Analysis of Lexical-Semantic Variants of Kinship (Wife, Stepmother) Expression Means in Female Gender. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*, 2021;24(1):71-72.
7. Rasulova ShKh, Karimova VV. On the onomasiological aspect of the study of female kinship terms in the Uzbek and Tajik languages. *Bulletin of the Bokhtar State University named after Nosir Khusrav. Humanities and Economics Series*. 2020;1-1(71):75-78.
8. Vakhobovna KV. The Lexical Plan Suppletivism in Turkic Languages. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, 2020;3(12):184-185.

9. Karimova V. Brief History of Researching Terms of Kinship in Uzbek and English Languages. Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University, 2019;1(12):156-162.
10. Каримова ВВ, Юлдашева ДА. The Responsibility of a Teacher for Increasing the Probability of Advancing Student Achievement. Молодой ученый, 2016;3-1(107):41.
11. Khamzaevna RM. Linguistic features of the novel "New Moscow Philosophy" by V. Pyetsuh. International Journal of Research 2020;7 (3):198-201.
12. Zokhidov I. Educational and Edifying Roles of the Physics Extracurricular Activities. Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University, 2019;1(2):319-322.
13. Abdullaev AN. Philosophical analysis of the phenomenon of creativity. Bulletin of science and education, 2020;3-3(81).
14. Abdullaev AN. The Social Philosophical Essence of the Coevolution of Society and Family. Theoretical & Applied Science, 2020;(2):733-736.
15. Nasriddinovich AA. (2020). The Features of Appearing Family in Modern Society. European science review, 2020;(3-4):69-72.
16. Abdullayev A. The relationship in the development of the family and society. Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University, 2019;1(1):114-118.