

Usbekistan braucht ökologisches Denken

Azamat Seitov Pulatovich

Doktor der Soziologie (DSc),

Leyli Seitova Pulatovna

Promotion in Wirtschaftswissenschaften

Zusammenfassung: Die Frage, wie sich die Gesellschaft zum Fällen von Bäumen verhält, ist nicht so einfach, wie es scheint. Wir sind uns sicher, dass jede soziologische Untersuchung die vorherrschende Meinung über die negative Einstellung der Gesellschaft zu diesem negativen Phänomen aufzeigen wird. Zweifellos hängt diese Meinung damit zusammen, wie sich die menschliche Umwelt buchstäblich vor einer Generation verändert hat, auch in Usbekistan. Trotzdem, es scheint gestern, war alles grün.

Schlüsselwörter: Usbekistan, ökologisch, soziologisch

Uzbekistan needs ecological thinking

Azamat Seitov Pulatovich

Doctor of Sociological Sciences (DSc),

Leyli Seitova Pulatovna

PhD in Economics

Abstract: The question of how society relates to tree felling is not as simple as it seems. Any sociological survey, we are sure, will show the dominant opinion about the negative attitude of society towards this negative phenomenon. Undoubtedly, this opinion is connected with how

literally in front of one generation the human environment has changed, including in Uzbekistan. Still, it seems yesterday, everything was green.

Keywords: Uzbekistan, ecological, sociological

Introduction. We have decided that public opinion is negative. However, all the difficulty arises when we begin to talk about what to do from the position of the sociology of ecology.

First, a little theory. Sociology of ecology is a branch of sociology that studies the relationship between human communities and the surrounding geographic-spatial, social and cultural environment, the direct and secondary impact of industrial activities on the composition and properties of the environment, the environmental impact of anthropogenic, especially urbanized, landscapes, and other environmental factors on the physical and mental health of a person and on the gene pool of human populations, etc. Science is very young, in fact, it began its journey from the middle of the twentieth century. In particular, the formation of this direction of sociology is associated with the activities of the Chicago School.

Separately, we emphasize that the sociology of ecology analyzes the natural environment as a differentiated system, the various components of which are in dynamic equilibrium, linking the environment and human activity into a single "nature - society" system, raises the question of managing and rationalizing the relationship between man and nature.

Now to the question of what to do. Society believes that cutting down trees is an unambiguous evil and must be fought against. And everyone is wondering why there are no decisive prohibitive actions on the part of, for example, the state. Excellent - everyone has banned what goes to the felling of trees, in particular, half were transplanted, the other was planted with large fines. All this, in the opinion of part of the public, will lead to the fact that people will stop cutting down trees.

At the same time, what do we get if we look through the prism of the sociology of ecology?

- One of the reasons for cutting down trees, for example, in Tashkent, is the construction of new buildings. Residents of the capital are sure that countless construction projects in the capital, first of all, entail the destruction of nature, in particular, perennial trees. Every year, most of the seedlings planted by thousands of workers at the expense of billions of dollars, they say, dry up before they reach summer.

Okay, let's listen, which means we stopped building. The first thing we get is a sharp rise in the cost of secondary housing. Are we ready to overpay?

Further, in order to stop the construction of new buildings, it is necessary to stop the influx of internal migrants who buy this housing. It means that "the people are arriving, but the capital is not rubber," and it is necessary to eliminate the reason, go ahead, strengthen the passport regime and return the institution of rigid registration. Are we ready for this?

Dust, stench, clanking machinery and everything else from construction sites is definitely bad. But let's remove the construction sites - where will you go to the builders? In labor migration, where are they humiliated? Tear them away from their families? Are you supporters of trees to bloom and children of migrants to live without their father's socialization? Are we ready to bring up children of labor migrants under the canopy of branched plane trees?

- There is no felling of trees, which means there is no cheap furniture made of wood. If you are against cutting down trees - just do not buy furniture made of wood, sleep on plastic. Are we ready for this? And until society says no furniture made of wood, no paper made of wood, no

building materials made of wood, etc. - trees will be cut down, even though no fines will stop them at night.

Except, of course, the physical elimination of woodcutters and their customers. But today they destroy it for felling, and tomorrow, maybe, for garbage thrown out of the window, because this is a “convenient and quick solution to the problem”. Are we ready for this ourselves?

Whether we like it or not, from the point of view of sociologists, our society, for example, in Uzbekistan, is an ordinary human society with market laws: if there is demand, there will be supply. And there is no getting away from it. Forbid cutting down trees here - you will sleep on metal furniture.

Trees are also notebooks. Who among those who oppose the felling of trees welcomes the transition to using tablets when organizing studies, because it saves trees. What is more important than the eyes of our children, blushing from the tablet screen, or cutting down trees? Are we ready for our children to wear glasses from the age of 10, preparing lessons under the weeping willow?

Therefore, there is a simple solution - "giving up things made of trees, which means there is no cutting down of trees." You just need to remove the demand for wood, then they will stop cutting down trees. Are we ready to live in a plastic society?

- Do you think bringing imported timber is a way out of the problem? Imports will lead to a significant rise in the price of wood products. Ask those who buy imported gasoline at gas stations, purchasing it at exorbitant prices.

Or do you think that if trees are not cut down on your street, but, for example, in Siberia, this will significantly change the situation with climate change? Ask the residents of Muynak, who will tell you that poisonous salt

from the bottom of the dried Aral Sea was found on the territory of the city of Washington.

- Refusal of firewood - and there is no felling. Okay. The same refusal of firewood will lead to coal soot.

Further. What is more important to bring natural gas to the public and build powerful compressors to catch up with gas instead of firewood, or pay pensions to the elderly?

What is more important than firewood or a rich table for the elderly? We are ready to consider trees more important than pensioners, since the construction of gas pipelines and the pumping of gas into them comes from the state budget, more than half, for example, in Uzbekistan, of which is spent on social needs.

When it comes to burning wood for cooking and heating, are trees or villagers more important to you?

- You can argue - why does not the state finance? It is necessary to understand that it is not the state that finances, but the official who chooses the object of financing on behalf of the state. Therefore, when you have the opportunity, follow the work of your deputy, both at the central and district (city) levels. Demand that he supervise the solution of yours, including environmental problems. Go to the polls. Otherwise, the one who goes to the polls will choose for you.

- Further, the trees are dying from lack of water. It means that all of them need to build canals-ditches and provide them with water. Great, but what is more important to water trees through canals in Tashkent or to save money so that people in the lower reaches, for example, in the Samarkand region or the Republic of Karakalpakstan, can just drink water? The position I have a counter - I don't care, I pay - has the right to be, but then

you must understand that the water will go to you, to your trees near the house, and not to people, with all the ensuing circumstances.

After all, the inhabitants of the lower reaches, now in 2021, are tormented by drought, due to environmental problems, due to the fact that people often put their individual needs above environmental ones.

- When everyone who is against the cutting down of trees, instead of:
wash your teeth from one glass of water, washes them under the powerful pressure of your tap,

separate household waste so that cardboard can be made from there, everything is dumped into one non-degradable bag,

buy and install at home special, sorry, toilets that save water, wash away with a powerful stream of simple spit,

install solar energy on the roof of his house on credit in order to meet his needs, buys a new comfortable car with a powerful motor on credit in order to release more carbon dioxide into the air,

reduce the diet of meat products in order to reduce the demand for slaughtering and grazing animals, which will save the grass cover in the region, they are sore on the Internet,

to support the increase in the city of environmentally friendly modes of transport, such as bicycles and scooters, seek to trim them in the city by car,

buy plastic doors that have good properties, persistently buy and install wooden doors,

transfer money, let one dollar for environmental projects of NGOs, simply sneer on social networks regarding deforestation,

posting photos on Instagram of planting trees on your street, writing angry comments about environmental policy, drinking cola and deliciously eating a hamburger in nature, cooked on a firewood grill,

etc, etc ..

Each of us, individual people, if he takes a personal real step to give up every day from harmful environmental actions, then this is a step of the whole society towards the protection of the environment, and hence the felling of trees.

For example, more than 52,000 of the 75,000 trees planted in Tashkent in 2021 have withered. Who planted them? Was it difficult to take a bucket of water and pour them over? Someone from those who planted, sent a request, for example, to their deputy, why did they choose a tree that did not withstand the harsh test of the ecology of the capital?

- And most importantly, what is more important than the economy or the environment? We need trees or economic growth, GDP, and hence the income of the common population. The same modern China or London during the formation of capitalism and their economic heyday led to serious environmental problems. Is it better to be poor among the trees or live well in the coal smog? What do you think?

Sheep and rams cause tremendous damage to nature, but what is more important than a well-fed shepherd or grass that pleases the eye? Is it a prosperous person or an environment? I have an answer and it is below.

The growth of the economy of Uzbekistan in 2021, according to the forecast of the World Bank, will reach 4.8%. Ecology requires huge costs. For example, global green finance exceeded \$ 282.2 billion in 2019 (<https://greenkaz.org/index.php/press-centr/novosti-v-mire/item/2887-ob-jomy-zeljonogo-finansirovaniya-vyrosli-na-50-i-prevysili-250-mlrd-v-2019-g>). Uzbekistan is already doing a lot of work, taking into account the possibilities of the budget (this is a topic for a separate publication)

There is much more to be said about the social impact of the fight against tree felling.

I understand that my words are extreme and a certain populism - but this is the harsh reality of life, which must be taken into account.

At the same time, are we staunch supporters of hemp in our open spaces? Does our words mean a call to society that it is necessary to accept and breathe in the dusty air?

Of course not.

Thus, the sociology of ecology requires a balanced approach, not populism.

Of course we are against cutting down trees. We just urge you to abandon drastic measures and revolutions. For example, we believe that any entrepreneur is more important than any tree, because he is a person, with all its pros and cons. And then what to do?

The main thing to note is that it is necessary to reach a public consensus through the work of journalists and sociologists in order to understand how much society is ready to give up the benefits associated with the use of wood. To what extent are people willing to give up the benefits of urbanization, which negatively affect the felling of trees - new buildings, the influx of internal migrants, asphaltting, financing the construction of irrigation ditches to the detriment of social benefits, an increase in the burden on entrepreneurs, etc.

After that, it is important to invite leading experts in urban studies in order to practically achieve an ecological balance in cities with the needs of economic development of the population.

Then, and only if there is a complete understanding of the population - why we sacrifice part of our well-being towards ecology, including deforestation, can strict administrative measures be introduced. That is, deforestation is an acute and urgent problem of our time, on the solution of

which the possibilities of effective development of cities, for example, of Uzbekistan, depend.

However, a necessary condition for their solution is the recognition of the priority of universal human values. Consequently, the developing human activity in the modern conditions of Uzbekistan acquires a new understanding - it cannot be considered truly reasonable, meaningful and expedient if it ignores the requirements and imperatives dictated by the environment.

In conclusion, I would like to note that society itself must understand, consciously and gradually abandon the usual things that destroy nature, for example, cutting down trees, raising and slaughtering a large number of animals, irrational use of water, lack of practice of preliminary home packing of garbage, etc. At the same time, it is important to simultaneously exert social pressure on the deputies so that they demand from various organizations to comply with the norms of environmental legislation.

That is, the solution to the problem of cutting down trees should not serve as an increase in social tension, but become an impetus for the formation of ecological thinking and the promotion of new values to the population, for example, of Uzbekistan, - the preservation of the ecosystem, the attitude towards the nature of the country as a unique ecosystem, a prudent and respectful attitude to living, joint evolution of nature and humanity.

References

1. Green financing increased by 50% [source <https://greenkaz.org/index.php/press-centr/novosti-v-mire/item/2887-ob-jomy-%20zeljonogo-finansirovaniya-vyrosli-na-50-i-prevysili-250-mlrd-v-2019-g>]
2. Desertification of Tashkent continues [source <https://kun.uz/ru/news/2021/06/09/prodoljayetsya-opustynivaniye-tashkenta-zasoxlo-boleye-52-tysyach-iz-75-tysyach-derevev-posajyennyx-v-2021-godu>]
3. Seitov A., Sabirova U. The current task of higher education - strengthening mahalles [source CUTTING EDGE-SCIENCE. International scientific and practical conference. January-February, 2021 Shawnee, USA Conference Proceedings. – P. 27-29. DOI: http://doi.org/10.37057/U_7]
4. Azamat Seitov. Balance of moral power and spirituality [source Asian Journal of Research (Japan) № 4-6, 2020 ISSN 2433-202x www.journalofresearch.asia <http://dx.doi.org/10.37057/2433-202x> DOI 10.37057/2433-202x Issue DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.37057/2433-202x-209-2020-4-6> Article DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.37057/2433-202x-2020-4-6-9>]
5. Chirkova L.M., Polyakov V.I. Ecology and Sociology. [source Basic research. – 2005. – № 7. – C. 102-103 URL: <http://www.fundamental-research.ru/ru/article/view?id=6400>]