

TASKS FOR DEVELOPING PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Nishonov Mirjalol Adkhamjonovich

Independent Researcher, Fergana State University

Orcid ID: 0009-0006-5882-6472

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17505148>



ARTICLE INFO

Received: 29th October 2025

Accepted: 30th October 2025

Online: 31st October 2025

KEYWORDS

employees of the internal affairs body, national and universal values, social laws, traditionalism and modernity, comparative analysis, analysis and synthesis, systematic and functional, professional ethics, patriotism.

ABSTRACT

The article examines the theoretical foundations of the development of the professional ethics of the employees of the internal affairs body, the socio-philosophical aspects of the development of the professional ethics of the employees of the internal affairs body, the prospects of the development of the professional ethics of the employees of the internal affairs body. Also, the system of patriotism training based on the development of professional ethics of internal affairs body employees was analyzed.

Introduction

The development of any society or civilization, along with economic, political, and social factors, is also closely connected to the moral factor. The stability of the moral environment, its foundation on high ethical ideals, and its embodiment of both national and universal moral values all positively influence the progress of any society. Generally speaking, before discussing the role of the moral environment in the postmodern world, it is important to clarify what the moral environment itself is and what structural elements it contains.

The concept of a moral environment is referred to in some foreign literature by the term "ethosphere" (from the Greek "*ethos*" – "custom, tradition" and "*sphaira*" – "sphere," meaning "moral shell"). This term has been interpreted differently by various scholars. Some researchers view the ethosphere as a kind of moral and spiritual diaspora of human societies.

Literature Review And Methods

Issues related to the development of professional ethics have been studied by J. Anderson, S. Anisimov, G. Belov, M. Weber, I. Ilyin, and V. Konev. The aspects of youth culture and tolerance in society have been examined as separate research problems by A. Bayley, I. Herder, E. Orlova, and M. Khomyake

In Uzbekistan, the theoretical and methodological foundations of the development of professional ethics have been studied by philosophers such as S. Agzamkhodjayeva, J. Tulenov, I. Imomnazarov, I. Jabborov, Y. Jumaboyev, E. Yusupov, S. Shermukhammedov, Kh. Shaykhova, Makhmud Sattor, A. Jalolov, S. Otamuratov, A. Sharipov, J. Yakhshilikhov, N. Mukhamadiyev, A. Erkeyev, O. G'aybullayev, I. Arzimatova, and D. Normatova.

Furthermore, the social-philosophical and historical problems associated with the development of professional culture have been analyzed in the scientific works of B. Aliyev, G.

Navro'zova, Q. Nazarov, A. Sharipov, H. Salomova, Z. Qodirova, A. Huseynova, M. Vokhidova, L. Gadoyeva, and Z. Akhmedova.

Results And Discussion

Since there is no universal moral unity for the whole world, societies tend to divide into ethospheric segments based on regional, national, cultural, religious, and linguistic identities. As a result, the current global ethospheric landscape resembles a diverse kaleidoscopic image. The ethosphere is also viewed as a network of values, traditions, and relationships that determine the behavior and moral character of a socio-political system. It is considered the moral counterpart of the biosphere—used to explain the ethical essence of the human-influenced world.

Another group of scholars interprets the term *ethosphere* not as something opposite to the biosphere, but as its most advanced evolutionary form. From their perspective, the ethosphere represents a higher stage of development than the *noosphere* (from the Greek “sphere of reason”), where all moral principles—including respect for all forms of life—become the main regulators of human relationships with one another and with the living world. Thus, the ethosphere is not seen as a purely social phenomenon but rather as a complex natural, moral, and social phenomenon.

From our point of view, the moral environment, or ethosphere, represents an integrated phenomenon encompassing all moral elements of relationships—between person and person, person and society, and person and nature. It includes all moral ideals, concepts, principles, and virtues present in social consciousness. The stability of the moral environment and the manifestation of moral principles in interpersonal relations are subjective in nature, as morality is not static but dynamic. Its evolution under the influence of various factors over time represents a specific form of social determinism.

The moral environment began to form with the emergence of early moral signs in human society—when behavior was guided not by biological motives and needs, but by moral necessity. Its formation was closely linked with primitive religious and mythological worldviews. Taboos existing in early societies were reinforced by the divine will. In this regard, the lifestyle of early tribal communities greatly influenced the emergence of the first moral codes.

However, the existence of a moral environment in a society does not necessarily mean that high moral ideals have been established. It merely indicates that morality exists, even in its simplest form. Some primitive moral norms may be regarded as deeply immoral in modern society—for example, polygamy, cannibalism, incest, or human sacrifice. These norms, once viewed as signs of moral superiority, are now completely rejected. Such moral differentiation is evident not only through history but also in contemporary tribal societies that still live at a primitive social stage. The presence of taboos in such communities does not indicate immorality, but rather that the moral environment has not yet fully developed.

It is not appropriate to interpret the moral environment as a single planetary whole, because every social unit, group, or society possesses a distinct moral environment shaped by various factors. Consequently, significant differences exist among the moral environments of different societies. Therefore, classifying moral environments becomes necessary. The classification can be based on factors such as language, religion, and geography.

In the modern world, the increasing influence of political institutions, the growing role of states, and the strengthening of national and territorial identity show that it is most appropriate to classify moral environments according to these factors. Based on these characteristics, the modern moral environment can be classified according to the following levels.

1. The Moral Environment of Small Social Groups (the moral atmosphere within a family, or that characteristic of a specific group or organization);
2. The Moral Environment within Social Classes and Categories (the moral atmosphere formed among various professional communities, intellectuals, youth, or migrants);
3. The Moral Environment Established within Nations, Ethnicities, and States;
4. The Moral Environment Characteristic of Peoples with Regional Commonality (for example, the moral environment of Central Asia, the Arab world, or Europe);

5. The Global Planetary Moral Environment.

The hierarchical levels of the moral environment listed above are interrelated: moral values at lower levels serve as the foundation for the formation of the moral environment at higher levels. For instance, the moral values nurtured in numerous families constitute the ethical foundation of the social class to which they belong; the moral norms practiced by social strata contribute to the moral framework of the nation or state; and the moral ideals prevailing within nations and countries form the essential material for the development of the moral environment of an entire region or even the planet as a whole.

The essence of the moral environment as a dynamic social phenomenon evolving under the influence of social evolution becomes especially evident in the age of globalization. The universalization of moral norms across various countries and regions is emerging as an initial step toward the creation of a unified, universal moral environment for the entire planet.

Conclusion

Globalization is not merely accelerating the pace of change in the world; rather, as the English sociologist Anthony Giddens notes, the world has become “elusive, impossible to grasp at one point.” In other words, today’s global world possesses a fundamentally new socio-cultural dynamic. Globalization is not a single, linear process but a complex interplay of multiple processes that are not always consistent with each other and sometimes even evolve in opposite directions. Therefore, it is difficult to achieve a holistic and comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon.

References:

- 1.Sharma, R. N. Ethosphere and Cosmosphere: Two New Concepts for World Bioethics, and Their Application to the Asian Segment. // Asian Bioethics in the 21st Century. – Eubios Ethics Institute; Asian Bioethics Conference, 2003.
- 2.Weber, M. Science as a Vocation and Profession. In: Selected Works. Moscow: Progress, 1990. – 456 p.
- 3.Giddens, A. Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives. (Trans. from English). Moscow: Ves Mir, 2004. – 120 p.
- 4.Jabborov, I. A Center of High Culture and Unique Spirituality. Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 2012. – 316 p.
- 5.Orlova, E. Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology. Moscow, 1994. – 384 p.