

SOCRATIC DIALOGUE AS A RESPONSE TO THE CHALLENGE OF THE EPOCH

Akhmedov B.A.

Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Yuldasheva T.A.

Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The modern epoch is more and more recognised as a society of risk, and the dialogical pedagogy, pedagogy of risk, is able to agitate the mind, enrage and excite listeners, and consciously provoke them to try different, unusual strategies of life creation relevant to it. Forming a new thinking image, where dialogical thinking and dialogical conduct play an important role, can be a fundamental response to the call of the epoch.

Keywords: Socratic dialogue, dialogical thinking, dialogical conduct, society of risk, intercultural dialogue.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62536/sjehss.v1i1.3>

The urgency of the problem.

In recent decades, modern philosophical, pedagogical, and political thought have increasingly turned to dialogue, rightly seeing in it the possibility of expanding the horizons of theoretical reflection and strengthening its practical orientation. Attempts to revive Socratic dialogue in educational practices can be considered various modern dialogic pedagogy. This is becoming widespread in European education systems, primarily in Germany. The introduction of Socratic dialogue into current educational and educational practices is due, on the one hand, to the effort to awaken independent creative thinking in pupils or students, and on the other hand, to deliberately provoke the public, as a result of which impulses are given to remove "closed topics", to remove prohibitions on discussing certain problems. Through such a dialogue, the population is transformed from a silent mass into a civil society, which is constituted and self-affirmed through the Socratic dialogue. All this actualises the philosophical study of the Socratic dialogue at the level of theoretical generalisation.

Analysis of recent sources and publications.

The problem of dialogic and critical pedagogy is highlighted in the works of H. Batishchev, M. Bakhtin, O. Bolnov, M. Buber, V. Goesle, and P. Freire.

However, despite its fruitful heuristic potential, Socratic dialogic pedagogy has not found adequate coverage.

In this context, the purpose of the article is to reveal new perspectives of findings of modern versions of the Socratic dialogue in the conditions of innovative educational contexts.

Presenting main material. Socratic dialogic pedagogy, like Socrates himself, is rightly called "dangerous" by some theoreticians [2, p. 141]. After all, the Socratic dialogue, which is conducted at the general level of society or even at the planetary level, provokes society and humanity as a whole, forces them to actively treat all manifestations and expressions of otherness. The society of risk, namely such, according to the definition of U. Beck, is the society of late modernism, corresponds to dialogic, "risky" pedagogy, capable of confusing the mind, infuriating and inciting listeners, deliberately provoking them to try other, unusual strategies of life creation. This, in particular, is indicated by P. Sloterdijk, speaking of the "anthropotechnical turn", which consists in the transition from "pedagogy as applied mechanics" to anthropotechnics of training

Modern Socratic dialogue in its macro dimension is non-linear.

He envisions not one Socrates, as in antiquity, having a conversation with his students, but at the same time many Socrates who provoke each other, trying to carry out a brain attack on public opinion, public consciousness, to overcome single-track thinking. Postmodern Socrates, just like his ancient prototype, is dangerous, but in a different way. As the German researcher of the perspectives of Socratic dialogic pedagogy H. Böhme notes, the postmodern Socrates is more capricious, more vulnerable, so "if he is not well spoken to, he becomes a cynic, can be obsessive and even crave revenge on his ancient prototype" [2, p. 141] The characterization given by H. Böhme to modern Socrates should be considered a warning. Indeed, innovative enthusiasm, the desire for change dominate the Socratic dialogues conducted at the level of society and humanity, and are risky strategies of life creation. But the main ethical question of the Socratic dialogue and the pedagogy based on it sounds like this: is Socrates responsible for the consequences of his educational practices? Ancient Socrates operates in the microfield and is self-responsible. He speaks on behalf of reason, which implies reasonable self-control of the participants in the dialogue. Numerous "postmodern Socratics", who undermine stereotyped models of thinking and acting, observe each other, making these observations the subject of discussion. They teach their listeners and interlocutors to desire innovations, live with them and constantly create them. Socratic dialogue is innovatively oriented. Observations and self-observations of dialogical practices are also reflected in it. "Socratic dialogue," L. Drucker points out, "in its broadest sense is practiced where people search for truth and common truth together. I would call such a dialogue Socratic, which occurs not only sporadically, but also permeates the entire dialogue" [3, p. 62]. As a result of Socratic dialogue, a real, actual, empirically existing communicative community is formed. It differs from the ideal communicative community in transcendental pragmatics precisely because of its actuality. But just like the counterfactual communicative community, it does not assume coercion and printing. This is a free communication community. One should agree with K.-O. Apel that "in a principled way, we take upon ourselves the responsibility for solving the problem of the real world - but not "alone", but as members of a real communicative

community, within its limits, in principle, only and possible understanding, and at the same time as members of an unlimited ideal communicative community that must be assumed to test and recognize our claims to truth. An ideal communicative community, of course, does not exist in reality, but anyone who argues in a serious way cannot help but appeal to an ideal community when arguing; he must anticipate his existence counterfactually, whether he wants it or not" [1, p. 49-50]. Gabernas understands the contradictory conditions of an ideal communicative community as mandatory conditions for changing the communicative practices of the academic community.

But the dialogic openness of Socratic communication should not be confused with the postmodern principle of universality. After all, the Socratic dialogue involves the selection of material, the thematization of those problems about which it is really impossible to remain silent... [4, p. 23]. For this, two components are necessary: dialogic thinking and dialogic behavior of those who organize and initiate this dialogue, that is, those "postmodern Socrates" mentioned above.

Dialogic thinking and dialogic behavior are essential aspects of the information society, which is communicative, a society of global networks. Taking into account this trend of postmodernism, dialogic pedagogy expands its horizons and problem field. Yes, in the middle of the 20th century. it was focused mostly on revealing the fundamental connection between the teacher and the student, the child and the adult, on creating the theory of the "pedagogical connection". This was an important moment for the humanization of pedagogical relations.

At the end of the 20th century this micro-optics vision of educational and didactic situations is complemented by macro-optics. Dialogic pedagogy becomes one of the foundations of "global learning", which is conceptualized as "education in the world society".

It should be noted that the very concept of dialogic pedagogy in the Western educational philosophical discourse goes beyond the narrow disciplinary identity of pedagogical science and is considered in the contexts of "world society", "society of global networks", "risk society". All these models of post-industrial society are based on the assumption of continuity of communications [9, p. 126]. So, today it is becoming obvious that globalization and the information revolution pose unique challenges in education as well, which in turn requires the restructuring of the traditional education system.

Dialogic pedagogy considers "global learning" and global educational practices as a polylogue in which information is transformed into life meanings, therefore, it requires a responsible attitude both to the selection of its content and to its influence on people who are at the same time in intercultural and pedagogical connections. Continuous learning, which is required by the method of production dominant in the information society, needs such an educational dialogue where the topics of learning would coexist with the topics of relearning, where the process of rapid obsolescence of knowledge would not scare away students, but would be considered by them as a chance for active life creativity.

The paradigm of communicative rationality contributes to the deepening of the understanding of the functional range of the dialogic approach and encourages its wide use. Throughout the 20th century. and at the beginning of the 21st century, it was the active use of this approach that gave reason to talk about the progress of modern pedagogical ideas.

Formalization of communication is important for spiritual production. If the latter is understood as generation, acquisition of knowledge and values, their transmission and reproduction, then outside of communication, this production can only have an indirect connection. Communication makes it possible to explore both the specifics of the spiritual production itself and to reveal the connection between its specific forms and the content of life activities of a certain generation of people, as well as to reproduce relations between different generations. In this sense, education and upbringing as a kind of spiritual production are not developed in a vacuum, but are determined by different social contexts. But the principle of dialogism in the life world of scientists, especially teachers, has not yet found sufficient coverage. Let's pay attention to the following point: mixed types of dialogue are becoming widespread, which are difficult to classify due to the blurring of the framework and the framework conditions themselves. A particularly difficult case is the coexistence of oral and written dialogue. That is why professional communication can be considered as something that arises in the life world of its carriers and is characterized by a combination of direct and mediated forms of communication.

This raises a difficult theoretical question about what a written dialogue is. Is it a real authentic dialogue or just a message about a dialogue, which itself is not a dialogue in the strict sense of the word, because the author of such a message, albeit a dialogical one, is only one person who reproduces a conversation, a conversation, a polemic, etc.? Sociologists have already felt the importance of this issue in connection with the spread of qualitative methods of sociological research, which are beginning to successfully compete with quantitative methods in the study of the everyday world (P. Berger, D. Douglas, M. Polner, A. Schütz). What is the recorded dialogue to be considered: a real event or just an impression of it? Such a formulation of the question, in which an ambivalent attitude towards the written form of dialogic speech is recorded, has grounds, because mediated dialogue needs interpretation. But the interpreter can occupy different positions: a detached interpreter, an included observer, or a co-participant in the dialogic event, who himself participates in the creation of a dialogic network.

These reflections primarily concern philosophical dialogue, which, according to V. Goesle's definition, is not only a literary genre dependent on the interpreter. Philosophical dialogue, which puts forward a demand for truth, differs from educational and educational dialogues, because this dialogue cannot remain only at the level of a clash or a meeting of ideas. It enters the practical plane and unfolds its potential here. The world of everyday life and the world of philosophy act as certain points of superposition, we can say that they overlap each other, enter into communication. Such dialogue is always intercultural. In general, V. Goesle considers the "clash of cultures" a requirement for developing a dialogue with a philosophical

color. General cultural prerequisites for the development of dialogue are the presence of a culture of communication, which is supported by society at the appropriate level, as well as the existence and provision of freedom of speech.

Therefore, interculturality can be considered an essential moment of dialogue, which goes beyond the boundaries of pure everyday life and assumes mutual transitions between the theoretical and practical levels. The high-quality dramaturgical representation of such a dialogue is determined by the distance between the real and imaginary participants of the dialogue. This, in particular, is paid attention to by researchers of the life world of diplomats, whose professional activity involves the acquisition of competence in conducting intercultural dialogue [5, p. 127-128]. Clash of cultures in the life world of diplomats belongs to the so-called "normal everyday life".

The "normal everyday life" of a teacher, at first glance, gives the impression of protection from the intrusion of "otherness". But the dialogue between a student and a teacher, between parents and children, even in the format of a conversation or conversation, has, in addition to the existential content, also an intercultural component. The misunderstanding between those who educate and those who are educated is due not least to the lack of dialogue between the subcultures of adults and children. This dialogue is the most complicated case of intercultural communication due to its asymmetry. The demarcation of such subcultures, which are existentially doomed to communication, is carried out through language. Teenagers' slang is an attempt to compensate for their asymmetrical, "subordinate" position in adult culture. After all, a child, if we apply Hegel's terminology to this case, is his own-other of his parents. Therefore, it is not surprising that common communicative spaces between adults and children are constituted as intercultural. This interculturality, which comes from the clash of subcultures even within the same national culture, can have different degrees of difference. It depends on the state of development of society, its cultural potential, the proportions between the experience of parents and children. In times of radical cultural shifts, when knowledge and technology change faster than the change of human generations, the experience of adults may be devalued, and children may surpass their parents in certain parameters of life competencies. In this case, the authoritative potential of didactic and educational dialogues passes to the children. As a result of the change of roles between the participants of the dialogue, there is a threat of losing the culture of communication, and therefore the freedom of speech, to which representatives of different generations have the right. The prerequisite for its preservation is care for support at the proper level and further development of a person's ability to dialogic thinking, without which the constitution of a human common world is impossible. The significance of intercultural dialogic thinking is growing in the era of the formation of the information society, when virtual and real dialogues form a common communicative space. "All our education," noted K. Jaspers, "is not so much knowledge of the material of certain sciences as knowledge of specific thinking inherent in certain subject areas, and in general it is knowledge of forms of thinking."

The requirement to learn independently or to think critically presupposes, first of all, the activation of the mechanism of dialogic thinking. The latter, in contrast to all types of dialogue represented in the theoretical and practical plane, acts as a manifestation of the essential forces of a person, is a spiritual expression of the specificity of human existence. After all, "the forces that lead to the movement and development of the rational, at the same time, also produce explosives in order to blow up this rational again" [6, p. 76]. Therefore, dialogical thinking is generated due to the contradiction of its self-development. It should be noted that K. Jaspers raises the question of the psychological relevance of logic, without which it is impossible to develop an effective strategy of intercultural didactic and educational dialogues, because different cultures of thinking and even techniques complicate real dialogues, make a thoughtful philosophical conversation impossible, turning it into mutual accusations or parallel monologues .

According to K. Jaspers, thinking techniques are its medium through which it enters the communicative plane. Among them, he singles out scholastic, experimental and dialectical [6, p. 76-80]. Adhering to this formal division, let's analyze the dialogic potential of each of these techniques. Thus, the scholastic technique, which presupposes the monopolization of truth and proceeds from the fact that contradictory concepts are unthinkable, that there is no reality that would correspond to these concepts, allows dialogue to be conducted only in the form of indoctrination. The questions raised in the dialogue using this technique are provocative in the sense that they suggest a number of different answers. Then the dialogue is subordinated exclusively to the task of finding the "correct" answer, which is already predetermined. In the dialogue, arguments against other possible but "wrong answers" are generated. This technique is used in manipulative dialogues based on contemplation and everyday experience, which in turn ensure the deployment of arguments based on the principle of self-intelligibility [6, p. 76]. K. Jaspers attaches special importance to the experimental technique of thinking. "This technique," he notes, "comes from the material that is contemplated, it forms, processes, classifies, analyzes only what is available. It circles around the endless but unchanging material in order to delineate it, not to question it."

At first glance, it seems that this technique is closed for dialogue. But it is not quite so. The fact is that the experimental technique of thinking is represented by constructivism. As K. Jaspers observes, "she does not focus on the phenomenon, but on the connection. She constructs possible interrelationships in thinking and verifies their truth through experience. Such thinking is marked by the interaction of theory and contemplation, but questions are generated by the theory, to which only one answer can be given through simple contemplation - yes or no" [6, p. 76], but here you can also ask questions about historical interrelationships, as well as about the results of comparing different theoretical constructions, therefore, develop a purely theoretical dialogue.

Since the time of Socrates, the dialectical technique of thinking has proven to be the most suitable for educational dialogue, especially when it is complicated by intercultural content. Dialectic, according to K. Jaspers, takes care of the formation, culture of thinking, and all other

techniques - about its cognitive capabilities. Due to the fact that dialectics reveals the internal contradictions of the subject, which determine its development, it allows for an endless educational dialogue.

We emphasize once again that the selection of such techniques and their analysis are purely formal. After all, a person consciously or unconsciously uses all these techniques in various combinations in his life. K. Jaspers calls them "thinking machines", which are based on the formal properties of what is thought, therefore, it makes sense to learn these techniques in the same way as one learns to count; it is not easy to master them, they must be studied and practiced in order to learn to use them" [6, p. 81]. Under the mastery of thinking techniques, one should also understand their functional capabilities and limitations. Thinking techniques have only a relatively universal character, because they have differences in Eastern and Western cultures, in addition, there are nationally determined intellectual styles, where preference is given to one or another thinking technique. Intercultural communication is established between such styles, and intercultural dialogue between its carriers.

Conclusions. The analysis of the formal side of the intercultural educational dialogue allows us to describe its possible representations at different levels of communicative practices. The conditioning of educational dialogue by thinking techniques opens up new perspectives in theoretical studies of the problems of intercultural pedagogy, which oscillates between abstract theorizing and ethnographic empiricism.

Thus, intercultural dialogue in education is a synthesis of dialogic forms, which preserves the functionality of dialogue as conversation, dialogue as research, dialogue as argument, and dialogue as instruction, and there is a fusion of dialogic thinking and dialogic behavior, which is manifested in modern versions of Socratic dialogue.

REFERENCES:

1. Sadikovna, T. I. (2021). The content of innovative activities and stages of application of educational innovations in the pedagogical process. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 9(10), 442-445.
2. Pazilova, M. E. (2004). Pedagogical bases of formation of student's spirituality by means of hadiths. pfn dissertation.
3. Ermekbaevna, P. M. (2023). Effective use of general human values in forming new thinking in students. *International Journal of Pedagogics*, 3(12), 58-62.
4. Mukimjonova, U. V., Khojaeva, N. T., & Mahmutaliyev, R. (2023). Biological description of pea (*Cicer arietinum*) plant. *Ethiopian International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 10(11), 602-603.
5. Mutalipova, M. (2017). Imomov M. Talimda ilgor xorijiy tajribalar moduli boyicha oquv-uslubiy majmua. T.: TDPU, 4.

6. Mahkamov, U. I., & Damirovna, B. S. (2022). Bo 'lajak pedagoglarda o 'zini-o 'zi boshqarish madaniyatini shakllantirish tizimi. *Journal of new century innovations*, 16(3), 48-52.
7. Damirovna, B. S. (2024). Ahloq tuzilishi ishlarining jazosining mohiyati va mazmuni. *Interpretation and Researches*, 2(1), 194-199.
8. Salimova, D. (2022). Characteristics of the development of plot-role playing games in the activity of preschool children. *Science and innovation*, 1(B5), 189-192.
9. Bilolova, Z. B. (2019). Application of information and communication systems and technologies in the social support and rehabilitation of families. *Методы науки*, 5(5), 18-19.
10. Salokhiddinova, G. B. (2020). The Role Of Mahalla Civil Society Institutes In Increasing The Youth's Social Activeness In The Family. *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations*, 2(11), 512-515.
11. Babaeva, S. (2021, March). Interpretation of images in modern novels. *E-Conference Globe*, 1(1), 51-53.
12. Mannapovna, J. O., Saparbayeva, D. T. (2022). The art of music is a factor of art technology and creativity. *Open Access Repository*, 8(11), 160-166.
13. Jabborova, O. M., & qizi Saparbaeva, D. T. (2022). Independent educational methodology. *American Journal of Pedagogical and Educational Research*, 6, 30-34.
14. Каримова, З. (2021). How to understand that a teacher is a professional: 5 main signs. *Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI*.
15. Akhtamovna, M. O. (2022). Foreign Language Teaching to Students Non-Linguistic Higher Education Institutions. *Global Scientific Review*, 10, 168-170.
16. Anvarova, M., Kungratov, I. (2023). Foreign experiences in the development of the digital education system. *Yangi O'zbekiston taraqqiyot strategiyasi talabalar nigohida*, 1(1), 731-733.
17. Anvarova, M. (2023). Improving media literacy using digital technologies in professional education. *Raqamli iqtisodiyot va axborot texnologiyalari*, 1(1), 311-317.
18. Anvarova, M. (2023). Raqamli transformatsiya jarayonining kichik va o'rta biznes korxonalariga asosiy ta'siri. *Raqamli iqtisodiyot va axborot texnologiyalari*, 1(1), 305-310.
19. Anvarova, M. (2023). Development of the digital economy in the republic of Uzbekistan. *Экономика и социум*, (6-1 (109)), 54-58.
20. Анварова, М. М. (2023). Инфраструктура информационных систем в эпоху Modern. *Экономика и социум*, (4-1 (107)), 1112-1119.
21. Anvarova, M. M. (2023). The information systems infrastructure in modern era. *Science and Education*, 4(3), 237-241.
22. Samieva, M., & Madyarova, M. (2022). The Growth of ICT indicators in the Digital Economy of Uzbekistan. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 15, 178-184.

23. Narzullaeva, M., Nabieva, F., & Samieva, M. (2022, December). A data analytics approach for assessing the role of chain supermarkets in the economy. In Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Future Networks & Distributed Systems (pp. 387-394).
24. Quvondiqov, S. S. (2022). Dynamic situation as a meta way of perception and understanding of competitive activity in martial arts.
25. Sidikovich, K. S. (2023). Analysis of national and foreign experiments on the diagnosis of processes for the development of a sense of patriotism. American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development, 16, 243-248.
26. Kadirova, O. K. (2022). From the history of Russian-Uzbek literary relations (comparative typological analysis). International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science, 1(12), 1082-1088.
27. Kadyrova, O. K. (2020). Professional pedagogical activity its types and structure. Актуальные проблемы гуманитарных и естественных наук, 1(12), 93-96.
28. Miraxmedov, F. (2022). Using multimedia tools to visualize the actions of young Greco-Roman wrestlers.
29. Miraxmedov, F. (2020). Improvement of Physical Education and Sport Efficiency in the Continuous Education System. Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI.