

A COMPARATIVE PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS OF FAMILY-SOCIETY RELATIONS IN EASTERN AND WESTERN CIVILIZATIONS

Tursunov Muxiddin Boltayevich

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Associate Professor

Termez University of Economics and Service, Termez, Uzbekistan.

E-mail: muxidintursunov6561@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23217253>

Annotatsiya. Mazkur maqolada Sharq va G'arb tamaddunida oila va jamiyat munosabatlari qiyosiy-falsafiy nuqtayi nazardan tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotning maqsadi oila-jamiyat aloqasining ikki sivilizatsiyaviy modelini aniqlash va ularning zamonaviy globallashuv sharoitidagi o'zgarishini baholashdan iborat. Tadqiqotda germenevtik, tarixiy-qiyosiy, sivilizatsion va tizimli yondashuvlar hamda birlamchi falsafiy matnlar tahlili qo'llanildi.

Natijalar shuni ko'rsatdiki, Sharq an'anasida oila jamiyatning kichik modeli sifatida qaralib, burch, avlodlar uzviyligi va jamoaviy axloq ustuvor ahamiyat kasb etadi; G'arb an'anasida esa oila va jamiyat o'rtasida individ huquqlari va fuqarolik jamiyati institutlari vositachilik qiladi. O'zbekiston tajribasida mahalla oilani jamiyat bilan bog'lovchi o'ziga xos institut hisoblanadi. Zamonaviy davrda ikki model o'zaro yaqinlashmoqda. Xulosa sifatida jamoaviy mas'uliyat va individual erkinlik muvozanati oila siyosati va yoshlar tarbiyasining konseptual asosi ekanligi ta'kidlanadi.

Kalit so'zlar: oila, jamiyat, Sharq tamadduni, G'arb tamadduni, qiyosiy falsafa, jamoaviylik, individualizm, mahalla, fuqarolik jamiyati, qadriyatlar.

Аннотация. В статье проводится сравнительно-философский анализ взаимоотношений семьи и общества в восточной и западной цивилизациях. Цель исследования – выявить две цивилизационные модели связи семьи и общества и оценить их трансформацию в условиях глобализации. Используются герменевтический, историко-сравнительный, цивилизационный и системный подходы, а также анализ первичных философских текстов. Результаты показали, что в восточной традиции семья рассматривается как «малая модель» общества, где приоритетны долг, преемственность поколений и коллективная мораль, тогда как в западной традиции связь семьи и общества опосредуется правами личности и институтами гражданского общества. В узбекской традиции особую роль играет махалля. В современную эпоху обе модели сближаются. В заключение подчёркивается, что баланс коллективной ответственности и индивидуальной свободы является концептуальной основой семейной политики и воспитания молодёжи.

Ключевые слова: семья, общество, восточная цивилизация, западная цивилизация, сравнительная философия, коллективизм, индивидуализм, махалля, гражданское общество, ценности.

SHARQ VA G'ARB TAMADDUNIDA OILA VA JAMIYAT MUNOSABATLARINING QIYOSIY-FALSAFIY TAHLILI

Annotation. This article presents a comparative philosophical analysis of family-society relations in Eastern and Western civilizations. It aims to identify two civilizational models linking the family and society and to assess their transformation under globalization. Hermeneutic, historical-comparative, civilizational and systemic approaches were applied to primary philosophical texts and scholarly literature. The findings indicate that in the Eastern tradition the family is conceived as a "small model" of society, with duty, intergenerational

continuity and collective morality as leading values, whereas in the Western tradition the family–society link is mediated by individual rights and civil-society institutions. In the Uzbek context, the mahalla serves as a distinctive mediating institution. In the contemporary period the two models are converging. The study concludes that a balance between collective responsibility and individual freedom constitutes a sound conceptual basis for family policy and youth upbringing.

Keywords: *family, society, Eastern civilization, Western civilization, comparative philosophy, collectivism, individualism, mahalla, civil society, values.*

INTRODUCTION

The family is the oldest and most durable social institution: it secures the transmission of language, morality and cultural values from one generation to the next. For this reason, a civilization's conception of society is first of all visible in its conception of the family. Aristotle regarded the household as the first component of the polis (Aristotle, 1995), while Confucius treated order within the family as the foundation of sociopolitical order (Confucius, 1979).

Globalization, digital communication, migration and urbanization are reshaping traditional family forms. In many Western societies family life has become increasingly individualized, whereas in Eastern societies modernization is transforming the structure of the extended family. Under such conditions, a philosophical comparison of how the two civilizations conceptualize family–society relations has both theoretical and practical relevance.

Existing scholarship has examined this field from sociological, psychological and legal perspectives. Hofstede (2001) and Triandis (1995) compared cultures along the individualism–collectivism dimension; Tönnies (2001) distinguished community from society; Hegel (1991) analyzed the family in its dialectical relation to civil society and the state. However, the Eastern and Western traditions have rarely been compared as integral philosophical models of family–society relations, and the place of Central Asian intellectual heritage and of the mahalla institution in such a comparison remains insufficiently addressed. This gap motivates the present study.

The aim of the research is to conduct a comparative analysis of the philosophical foundations of family–society relations in Eastern and Western civilizations. The objectives are: (1) to identify the philosophical-ethical foundations of the Eastern model; (2) to trace the ideational formation of the Western model; (3) to highlight the Central Asian and Uzbek experience; and (4) to determine directions of contemporary convergence. The working hypothesis is that the two models are not opposed but complementary, and that their balance supports a stable relationship between family and society.

METHODS

Research design

The study adopts a qualitative socio-philosophical design within an interpretivist paradigm, which assumes that values and family norms are socially constructed and context-dependent. No surveys or experiments were conducted; the analysis is based on primary philosophical texts and secondary scholarly sources. As the research involved no human participants, ethical review was not required.

Sources and selection criteria

Two groups of sources were analyzed: (a) primary philosophical and ethical texts (Aristotle, Confucius, Al-Farabi, Yusuf Khash Hajib, Kai Ka'us, Ibn Khaldun, Locke, Hegel);

and (b) secondary theoretical and comparative works (Tönnies, Durkheim, Hofstede, Triandis, Giddens, Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, Fei, Inglehart and Welzel). Sources were selected for their direct relevance to family or social structure, for representativeness across civilizations, and for publication by recognized academic presses.

Analytical procedure

A hermeneutic method was used to interpret the texts; a historical-comparative method to compare stages in the formation of each model; a civilizational approach to treat the family as a product of a particular cultural-historical context; and a systemic approach to view the family as a component of the social system. The comparison was structured around five criteria: (1) the basic social unit; (2) the leading principle; (3) intergenerational relations; (4) the mediating institution between family and society; and (5) the main source of upbringing.

Limitations

“East” and “West” are used as ideal-typical categories, which simplifies their internal diversity. The study is conceptual and does not include empirical data.

RESULTS

The Eastern model

In the Eastern texts analyzed, the family is not a mere aggregate of individuals but an organic whole linking generations. In Confucian thought, filial duty (xiao) and ritual propriety (li) connect relations within the family to the order of society and the state (Confucius, 1979). Fei (1992) described Chinese society through the “differential mode of association”, in which social ties extend outward from the family in concentric circles.

In the Islamic-cultural milieu, Al-Farabi (1985) depicted society as an interdependent system whose attainment of happiness depends on cooperation and moral education. Yusuf Khass Hajib (1983) presented justice, contentment and proper upbringing as interrelated conditions of personal and social welfare. Kai Ka’us (1951) set out norms of conduct between parents and children, spouses and neighbors as practical rules of social life, and Ibn Khaldun (1967) identified kinship-based solidarity (asabiyya) as the basis of social cohesion.

Four features of the Eastern model were thus identified: the family as a small model of society; the priority of duty over rights; mutual care between generations as a social guarantee; and moral education that begins in the family and is reinforced by communal oversight.

The Western model

In the Western tradition Aristotle (1995) treated the household as the first component of the polis but distinguished civic life as a higher sphere of free deliberation. Locke (1988) separated familial from political authority and grounded the latter in consent. Hegel (1991) described the family, civil society and the state as three moments of ethical life: the family as an immediate unity based on love, and civil society as a system of needs and interests.

Tönnies (2001) characterized the shift from kinship-based community to contractual society as a hallmark of modernization, and Durkheim (2014) traced the transition from mechanical to organic solidarity. Giddens (1992) argued that modern intimacy rests on mutual consent rather than obligation (the “pure relationship”), while Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (1995) described family life as shifting from a prescribed order to a “choice biography”.

The Central Asian and Uzbek experience

The mahalla was found to function as a link between the family and the wider community, performing the functions of neighborly mutual aid, educational oversight and the preservation of values.

The Family Code of Uzbekistan defines the family as the basic unit of society (Republic of Uzbekistan, 1998), and Karimov (2008) treated the family as an important factor in the formation of spirituality.

Comparative findings

Table 1. Comparative characteristics of the Eastern and Western models

Criterion	Eastern model	Western model
Basic unit	Family and community	Individual and individual rights
Leading principle	Duty, responsibility, respect	Freedom, autonomy, choice
Intergenerational ties	Organic, multigenerational, mutual care	Relatively independent, nuclear family
Mediating institution	Mahalla, kinship network, tradition	Civil-society institutions, state guarantees
Source of upbringing	Family, communal oversight, religious-moral norms	Family, education system, mass media

Source: compiled by the author.

DISCUSSION

The results suggest that the difference between the two models lies not in one civilization being “better” than the other, but in how the primary social unit is understood. This agrees with the individualism–collectivism polarity identified by Hofstede (2001) and Triandis (1995), while complementing it philosophically: in the Eastern model collectivism has a moral-ontological basis (duty and continuity), whereas in the Western model individualism rests on a legal-political basis (consent and contract).

Regarding convergence, Inglehart and Welzel (2005) showed that economic development strengthens self-expression values while cultural traditions persist. The present analysis is consistent with this: attention to individual rights and gender equality within the family is growing in Eastern societies, while concern over weakened communal solidarity has renewed interest in family, local community and social capital in the West. The working hypothesis of complementarity is therefore supported.

The mahalla is functionally close to Western civil-society institutions but differs in origin: it rests on traditional solidarity and trust rather than on formal contract. In Tönnies’s (2001) terms, it partly bridges the community–society duality within a single institution, which gives the Uzbek experience particular theoretical value.

Practical implications include harmonizing the preservation of national values with the protection of individual rights and social guarantees in family policy; developing family values together with critical thinking in education; and using the educational potential of the mahalla.

The study is conceptual, and the categories “East” and “West” are conditional. Future research should apply empirical and mixed-method approaches (surveys, in-depth interviews) to specific countries and examine the internal diversity of both models.

CONCLUSION

In Eastern civilization, family–society relations are grounded in duty, organic continuity and moral harmony; in Western civilization they developed historically through individual freedom, contractual thought and civil-society institutions. In Uzbekistan the mahalla is a distinctive link between family and society.

Under globalization the two models are converging, and the most viable orientation is a balance between collective responsibility and individual freedom. These conclusions provide a theoretical basis for strengthening the institution of the family and improving youth upbringing and social policy.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Farabi. (1985). On the perfect state (R. Walzer, Trans.). Clarendon Press.
2. Aristotle. (1995). Politics (E. Barker, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
3. Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (1995). The normal chaos of love. Polity Press.
4. Confucius. (1979). The Analects (D. C. Lau, Trans.). Penguin Books.
5. Durkheim, É. (2014). The division of labor in society (W. D. Halls, Trans.). Free Press.
6. Fei, X. (1992). From the soil: The foundations of Chinese society (G. G. Hamilton & Z. Wang, Trans.). University of California Press.
7. Giddens, A. (1992). The transformation of intimacy: Sexuality, love and eroticism in modern societies. Polity Press.
8. Hegel, G. W. F. (1991). Elements of the philosophy of right (A. W. Wood, Ed.; H. B. Nisbet, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
9. Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations (2nd ed.). Sage.
10. Ibn Khaldun. (1967). The Muqaddimah: An introduction to history (F. Rosenthal, Trans.). Princeton University Press.
11. Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence. Cambridge University Press.
12. Kai Ka'us ibn Iskandar. (1951). A mirror for princes: The Qabus Nama (R. Levy, Trans.). Cresset Press.
13. Karimov, I. A. (2008). Yuksak ma'naviyat – yengilmas kuch. Ma'naviyat.
14. Locke, J. (1988). Two treatises of government (P. Laslett, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.
15. Republic of Uzbekistan. (1998). Family Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan.
16. Tönnies, F. (2001). Community and civil society (J. Harris, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.
17. Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism and collectivism. Westview Press.
18. Yusuf Khass Hajib. (1983). Wisdom of royal glory (Kutadgu Bilig) (R. Dankoff, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.