IRSTI 111.1:141.319 https://doi.org/10.48010/2026.2/1999-5911.08

PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS OF CAUSAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE UNIVERSE

[1]S. Jumaniyozova*
[1]Republican Center of Spirituality and Enlightenment (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)
[1]pnr9323@mail.ru

[1]С.Б. Жуманиёзова
[1]Республикалық руханият және ағарту орталығы (Ташкент, Өзбекстан)
[1]pnr9323@mail.ru

***Citation**:* Jumaniyozova S.B. Philosophical aspects of causal relationships in the universe // Al-Farabi. – 2026. – Vol. 25. № 2(94). – P. 96-106.

Abstract. This article examines causality as a fundamental principle of the unity and development of the universe. The study explores the ontological, epistemological, and ethical dimensions of causality through an interdisciplinary framework that integrates dialectical-systemic, hermeneutic, and synergetic approaches. Particular attention is given to the interdependence of cause and effect, the dialectical relationship between necessity and randomness, and the role of time and motion as essential conditions of causal processes. The article analyzes the evolution of causal thought from classical philosophy to contemporary scientific paradigms, including relativity theory, quantum mechanics, systems theory, and synergetics. It argues that causality should be understood not as a linear deterministic sequence but as a dynamic and self-organizing network of interactions characterized by feedback, emergence, and probabilistic development. Special emphasis is placed on the anthropic principle and the role of consciousness as a higher form of causality that introduces purpose, meaning, and ethical responsibility into the structure of reality. The study concludes that causality constitutes a universal principle linking nature, consciousness, and culture within an evolving and interconnected cosmos.

***Keywords*:** cause and effect, anthropic principle, randomness, quantum mechanics, theory of relativity, space, time.

Introduction

The idea of the unity of the universe is grounded in the existence of causal relationships arising from the wholeness of being. Space and time constitute the fundamental framework of this unity, organizing the interconnection of all entities and ensuring the transformation of potentiality into actuality [3, p. 218]. These categories are not merely empirical concepts but metaphysical constants through which existence unfolds. Human experience demonstrates that events in nature are interconnected, although their interaction reveals both necessity and randomness. As Heraclitus ob-

* Author-correspondent: S.B. Jumaniyozova, pnr9323@mail.ru

served, “Everything flows” emphasizing that change is an essential attribute of being and causality its rational expression [1, p. 15]. Aristotle likewise argued that randomness does not negate causality but represents the intersection of independent causal chains [4, p. 153]. From elementary particles to galaxies, all systems operate through cause-and-effect relations governed by universal order.

The diversity of cosmic systems generates complex causal structures that sustain the dynamic equilibrium of the universe. Consequently, causality functions both as a principle of order and a mechanism of development, uniting change and stability within a single process [2]. The problem of causality has occupied a central place in philosophical thought. Aristotle’s doctrine of the four causes-material, formal, efficient, and final-provided a comprehensive framework for explaining natural and artificial phenomena [4, p.153]. By linking causality with teleology, he argued that every process tends toward an inherent purpose. Thomas Aquinas later integrated this understanding into Christian metaphysics, identifying divine causation as the ultimate source of motion and existence.

In modern philosophy, David Hume challenged the notion of objective causal necessity, reducing it to habitual associations formed in human consciousness. Responding to this skepticism, Immanuel Kant argued that causality is an a priori category of the mind that structures experience and mediates between ontology and epistemology [3, p. 218]. German classical philosophy, particularly Hegel’s dialectics, reinterpreted causality as a dynamic process in which cause and effect continuously transform into one another. Hegel maintained that necessity manifests itself through contingency, making causality a self-developing principle rather than a linear sequence of events [1, p. 15].

Twentieth-century scientific developments further expanded the concept of causation. Einstein’s theory of relativity united space and time into a single continuum and demonstrated that causal relations depend on the observer’s frame of reference [6]. At the same time, Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle revealed that causality at the quantum level is probabilistic rather than strictly deterministic [7]. Bogdanov’s Tektology introduced a systemic understanding of causality based on interdependence and feedback among subsystems, anticipating later cybernetic and synergetic approaches [5].

Contemporary philosophy of science continues to explore causality through probabilistic, systemic, and cosmological perspectives. Thinkers such as Karl Popper and Hermann Weyl emphasized falsifiability, symmetry, and the relational nature of reality [1, p. 15]. These developments culminate in modern quantum cosmology, where Everett’s many-worlds interpretation suggests the coexistence of multiple causal possibilities. Thus, causality remains a key concept at the intersection of physics, metaphysics, and cognitive science, supporting the view of the universe as a self-organizing system governed by both necessity and freedom [2].

Methodology

The study of causality requires an interdisciplinary methodology capable of integrating metaphysical reflection and scientific inquiry. Accordingly, this research employs a combined dialectical-systemic, hermeneutic, and synergetic approach. This

methodological synthesis makes it possible to interpret the universe as an interconnected system in which causes and effects continuously interact and shape future states.

The dialectical method provides the philosophical foundation of the study. Originating in the thought of Heraclitus and further developed by Hegel, dialectics views reality as a self-developing whole driven by internal contradictions. Within this framework, cause and effect are not isolated phenomena but mutually conditioning moments of a single dynamic process. Hegel's dialectical logic demonstrates that every cause becomes an effect and every effect becomes a new cause, revealing the self-mediating character of reality [8].

This perspective is complemented by the systemic approach, which interprets natural and social phenomena as interconnected hierarchical structures. Drawing on Bogdanov's Tektology, Bertalanffy's General System Theory, and cybernetics, causality is understood as a network of relations operating through feedback mechanisms [5]. In such systems, effects may influence causes, creating adaptive and self-regulating structures. Prigogine's theory of dissipative structures further shows that order can emerge from instability, demonstrating the coexistence of necessity and randomness within evolutionary processes [12].

The hermeneutic method extends the analysis beyond physical causation to the sphere of meaning. Following Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer, hermeneutics treats causality as a process of disclosure and interpretation. Heidegger's understanding of *aitia* emphasizes that causation is not merely mechanical determination but the bringing of something into presence. Human cognition therefore functions as a causal act: by interpreting and conceptualizing reality, consciousness transforms potential meanings into actual knowledge. In this sense, the observer becomes part of the observed system, linking physical causation with meaning generation [3, p. 220].

The synergetic approach, developed by Haken and Prigogine, provides a scientific model for understanding self-organization and nonlinear development. It explains how complex systems evolve through interactions between order and fluctuation, where small causes may produce large effects. Synergetics bridges classical determinism and quantum indeterminacy, demonstrating that causality is probabilistic, relational, and evolutionary rather than purely mechanical [2; 12]. The concepts of feedback, bifurcation, and autopoiesis further reveal the recursive nature of causal processes in both living systems and human cognition.

Methodologically, this study combines classical philosophical perspectives-including Aristotle's teleological causality, Aquinas's metaphysical hierarchy, and Kant's a priori categories-with modern scientific paradigms such as relativity theory, quantum mechanics, and systems theory. This integration recognizes that no single discipline can fully explain the complexity of causation. Philosophy provides conceptual interpretation, science offers empirical insight, and logic supplies formal coherence.

The research also adopts a comparative-historical perspective, tracing the development of causal thought from antiquity to contemporary philosophy and science. By comparing metaphysical, scientific, and cybernetic models, the study highlights both the continuity and transformation of causal concepts across intellectual traditions.

Finally, causality is approached as both a cognitive and ethical category. Cognitively, knowledge arises through the transformation of experience into meaningful patterns. Ethically, causality grounds responsibility, since every action produces consequences. Following Whitehead's process philosophy and Kant's moral philosophy, the study recognizes that the analysis of causality is inseparable from questions of value and human responsibility [17].

By integrating dialectical, hermeneutic, and synergetic perspectives, the methodology presents causality as a universal principle connecting knowledge and existence, motion and meaning, necessity and freedom. This interdisciplinary framework allows causality to be understood as the dynamic logic through which reality continuously organizes, develops, and interprets itself.

The Interdependence of Cause and Effect

The relationship between cause and effect constitutes one of the fundamental principles of philosophy and science. Causality is not an external law imposed on reality but an immanent principle through which the universe maintains coherence and development [2]. Every state of reality arises from preceding conditions and becomes the basis for subsequent transformations. Aristotle explained this process through the transition from potentiality to actuality and emphasized the roles of efficient and final causes in the unfolding of the cosmos [4, p. 153].

Spinoza interpreted causality as the expression of a single infinite substance, where all events are interconnected within a necessary order [1, p. 15]. Hegel further developed this idea by arguing that cause and effect are not separate entities but different moments of the same process. Every cause becomes an effect, and every effect becomes a cause, making causality circular and dialectical rather than purely linear [1, p. 15]. Consequently, causality appears as a principle that unites continuity and change within a single dynamic system [3, p. 218].

This understanding is reinforced by systemic and synergetic approaches. Bogdanov's Tektology and General System Theory view causality as a network of interdependent relations operating through feedback mechanisms [5]. In such systems, effects may influence their causes, creating adaptive and self-regulating structures. Synergetics extends this perspective by demonstrating that complex systems evolve through nonlinear interactions, where fluctuations can generate new forms of order [12]. Causality therefore appears not only as a mechanism of stability but also as a source of development and creativity.

The human dimension introduces intentional and teleological forms of causality. Unlike natural processes, human actions are guided by goals, values, and meanings. Aristotle's concept of final causality finds a modern expression in Kant's teleology of reason, according to which individuals actively shape the causal structure of their world through conscious action [3, p. 220]. Teilhard de Chardin's concept of the noosphere further emphasizes the role of consciousness as a medium through which the universe becomes aware of itself and participates in its own evolution.

From an epistemological perspective, causality is inseparable from cognition. Knowledge is both an effect of reality and a cause of transformation, as human understanding reorganizes experience and influences future action. Contemporary physics and cognitive science reinforce this view by demonstrating that observation and interpretation participate in the formation of reality [6].

Modern cosmology also supports the principle of causal interconnectedness. Relativity theory describes the universe as a network of causal relations structured by spacetime, while quantum entanglement reveals forms of nonlocal interdependence that challenge classical distinctions between cause and effect [6]. The anthropic principle similarly suggests that the causal structure of the universe is compatible with the emergence of life and consciousness [3, p. 220].

Thus, the interdependence of cause and effect reveals causality as a universal ontological principle that integrates nature, consciousness, and culture into a single evolving whole. It functions not only as a law of physical processes but also as a principle of meaning, development, and human responsibility [1, p. 15].

Necessity and Randomness

The relationship between necessity and randomness is one of the central problems of causal philosophy. Necessity expresses the lawful and ordered structure of reality, whereas randomness reflects contingency and unpredictability arising from the interaction of multiple causal processes [2]. However, these principles should not be understood as opposites; rather, they represent interconnected aspects of a single reality.

In ancient philosophy, necessity was associated with the rational order of the cosmos. Heraclitus linked it to the *logos*, while Aristotle distinguished logical, natural, and hypothetical forms of necessity [1, p. 15; 4, p. 153]. At the same time, Aristotle defined chance as the intersection of independent causal chains, emphasizing that randomness does not negate causality but represents a particular mode of its manifestation [4, p. 153]. Epicurus introduced the idea of indeterminacy through the concept of the atomic *clinamen*, suggesting that spontaneity and freedom are possible within nature. This intuition anticipated modern scientific perspectives, particularly quantum mechanics, where events at the microscopic level are described probabilistically rather than deterministically [6].

Medieval and modern philosophy further developed the problem. Thomas Aquinas viewed contingency as compatible with divine order, while Leibniz combined determinism with the principle of sufficient reason, according to which nothing occurs without a cause [2; 3, p. 218]. Hume challenged the objective necessity of causal relations, interpreting them as habitual associations in human experience. In response, Kant argued that necessity is an a priori category of reason that structures all possible experience [3, p. 218]. A significant synthesis was achieved in Hegel's dialectics. Hegel maintained that necessity manifests itself through contingency and that what appears accidental from a limited perspective may be necessary from the standpoint of the whole [1, p. 15]. Consequently, development emerges

ISSN 1999-5911 (Print)
ISSN 2960-2173 (Online)

through the interaction of inner necessity and external conditions, transforming randomness into a factor of change and self-realization.

Contemporary science supports this dialectical perspective. Quantum theory reveals objective indeterminacy, while synergetics demonstrates that fluctuations and random events can generate new forms of order [12]. In complex systems, randomness acts as a source of innovation, whereas necessity provides structural coherence. Biological evolution, for example, depends on random mutations, but their preservation is governed by the necessity of natural selection.

Thus, necessity and randomness should be understood as complementary dimensions of causality. Necessity ensures continuity and order, while randomness enables novelty and development. Their interaction underlies the dynamic and creative character of the universe.

Scientific Developments: From Determinism to Probability

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries significantly transformed the understanding of causality. Classical determinism, exemplified by Laplace's concept of an intellect capable of predicting all future events from complete knowledge of initial conditions, was challenged by developments in modern physics.

Quantum mechanics demonstrated that uncertainty is an objective feature of reality rather than a limitation of human knowledge. Heisenberg's uncertainty principle showed that the position and momentum of a particle cannot be determined simultaneously with complete precision, introducing probability into the structure of causality [6]. Likewise, Einstein's theory of relativity revealed that causal relations depend on the observer's frame of reference, making temporal order relative rather than absolute [7].

Further developments in systems theory and synergetics expanded this perspective. Prigogine's theory of dissipative structures demonstrated that order could emerge from instability and that small fluctuations may generate large-scale transformations in open systems [12]. Consequently, randomness appears not as the absence of causality but as a factor of development and self-organization.

From a philosophical standpoint, chance reflects the complexity of causal networks rather than the absence of underlying order. Bogdanov emphasized that different types of systems generate varying degrees of predictability, while Whitehead viewed every event as a synthesis of determination and novelty [5; 17]. Thus, contemporary science increasingly understands causality as a dynamic interplay of necessity and probability, where order and uncertainty coexist within the evolutionary development of the universe.

Synergetic and Evolutionary Models

The synergetic paradigm provides an important framework for understanding the relationship between necessity and randomness. According to Haken and Prigogine, complex systems evolve through the interaction of order and fluctuation. Order parameters represent structural necessity, while fluctuations introduce variability and innova-

tion. At critical points, systems may undergo bifurcation and follow alternative paths of development [12].

From this perspective, evolution does not contradict causality but represents its dynamic expression. In biological evolution, random mutations generate diversity, whereas natural selection determines which forms persist. Similarly, social and cultural innovations emerge unpredictably but survive only when they correspond to existing structural and value conditions. Randomness therefore acts as a source of creativity, while necessity ensures continuity and coherence.

The synergetic model also has anthropological and ethical significance. Human freedom emerges within objective conditions and is realized through conscious choice. As Sartre argued, individuals create themselves through decisions made within the limits of necessity. Kant's moral philosophy similarly interprets freedom as the rational realization of universal principles rather than the absence of causality [3, p. 220].

Consequently, necessity and randomness should be viewed as complementary dimensions of development. Necessity provides order and stability, whereas randomness enables innovation and transformation. Their interaction explains the evolutionary character of natural, social, and cultural processes and demonstrates that causality is not a rigid chain of events but a dynamic and creative principle of becoming [1, p. 15; 7].

The Problem of Time and Motion

Time and motion are fundamental conditions of causality. Every causal relation presupposes change, while every change unfolds in time. Thus, time and motion are not merely measures of events but ontological forms through which reality develops [3, p. 218].

In classical philosophy, Aristotle defined time as the measure of motion with respect to before and after, linking temporality directly to the realization of potentiality in actuality [4, p. 153]. This understanding established the close relationship between causality, change, and becoming. Kant later transformed this perspective by arguing that time is an a priori form of intuition. According to him, temporal succession is not derived from experience but constitutes the framework that makes causal experience possible [3, p. 218]. Consequently, causality and temporality are inseparable conditions of human knowledge.

A different interpretation was proposed by Bergson, who distinguished measurable time from lived duration (*la durée*). He emphasized that real time is a continuous process of becoming rather than a sequence of discrete moments [9]. This view highlights the creative and evolutionary character of temporal processes.

The scientific understanding of time changed significantly with Einstein's theory of relativity, which united space and time into a single continuum and demonstrated that temporal order depends on the observer's frame of reference [6]. Although causality remains preserved, its structure becomes relational rather than absolute [7]. Quantum mechanics introduced further complexity by revealing that events at the microscopic level are governed by probabilities rather than strict determinism. Heisen-

ISSN 1999-5911 (Print)
ISSN 2960-2173 (Online)

berg's uncertainty principle showed that causal relations cannot always be described through precise temporal sequences [6].

Modern theories of self-organization and thermodynamics add another dimension to the problem. Prigogine demonstrated that irreversible processes and entropy provide time with a direction, often described as the "arrow of time" [12]. At the same time, open systems are capable of generating new forms of order, making temporality not only a process of decay but also a source of creativity and development.

Existential and phenomenological philosophy further deepened the concept of time. Heidegger interpreted temporality as the horizon of human existence, arguing that past, present, and future are interconnected dimensions through which individuals realize possibilities and assume responsibility for their actions [1, p. 15]. In this sense, time becomes not only a physical but also an ethical and existential category.

Contemporary cosmology and information theory increasingly regard time as an emergent and relational phenomenon arising from interactions within complex systems. These approaches support the view that time and motion form a dynamic continuum through which causality unfolds. Every transformation-from microscopic process to cosmic evolution-represents the transition from potentiality to actuality, making temporality an essential condition of becoming.

Thus, the unity of time and motion reveals the dynamic nature of existence. Causality cannot be separated from temporality, since every cause presupposes a before and every effect an after. At the same time, modern philosophy and science demonstrate that temporal order is relational, probabilistic, and evolving, reflecting the complex and self-organizing character of the universe.

The Anthropic Principle and the Role of Consciousness

Consciousness introduces a distinctive dimension into causality by transforming physical determination into purposeful and reflective action. Unlike natural processes, human activity is guided by intentions, values, and meanings. Aristotle's concept of final causality (*causa finalis*) provides the philosophical foundation for this view, explaining causality not only in terms of how events occur but also why they occur [4, p. 153].

The teleological interpretation of causality was further developed by Aquinas, Kant, and Hegel. While Aquinas associated final causality with divine order, Kant emphasized the active role of reason in organizing experience and constructing purposive frameworks [3, p. 220]. Hegel interpreted consciousness as the stage at which reality becomes aware of itself, transforming necessity into freedom through self-reflection [1, p. 15].

In modern cosmology, these ideas are reflected in the anthropic principle. Formulated by Brandon Carter and later developed by Barrow and Tipler, it argues that the fundamental constants of the universe permit the emergence of life and consciousness [15]. The weak version states that observers exist because the universe allows their existence, whereas the strong version suggests that the universe must possess properties that make observers possible. In this sense, consciousness appears not merely as

a product of cosmic evolution but as an essential component of the universe's intelligibility.

Teilhard de Chardin expanded this perspective through the concept of the noosphere, describing evolution as a progression from matter to life and from life to consciousness [14]. Human beings represent the stage at which the universe becomes capable of reflecting upon itself. Consciousness therefore functions as a higher form of causality, transforming knowledge into new forms of cultural, scientific, and moral development.

From a systemic perspective, consciousness operates as a feedback mechanism within cosmic evolution. Through cognition, technology, and ethical action, humanity continuously reshapes the conditions of future development. Knowledge becomes both an effect of reality and a cause of further transformation [5]. This reciprocal relationship highlights the role of consciousness as an active participant in the causal structure of the universe.

The ethical implications of this perspective are significant. If human beings participate in universal causality, every action generates consequences that extend beyond the individual. Responsibility therefore arises from awareness of causal interdependence. Freedom is not the absence of necessity but its conscious realization through reason and moral choice [1, p. 15].

Contemporary discussions in quantum physics and participatory cosmology further emphasize the role of observation and information in the constitution of reality [6]. Although interpretations differ, they reinforce the idea that consciousness cannot be treated as external to the universe it seeks to understand. Rather, consciousness functions as both an outcome and a continuation of cosmic evolution.

Thus, the anthropic principle and the philosophy of consciousness reveal causality as a process that culminates in self-reflection. Through knowledge, creativity, and ethical action, humanity participates in the ongoing self-organization of the universe, linking necessity and freedom, nature and meaning, within a single evolutionary process.

Conclusion

Causality represents the fundamental law of the universe - the inner logic that unites all forms of being. Every phenomenon arises from a previous cause and, in turn, becomes a cause for what follows. This continuous interaction ensures the coherence and development of the cosmos. The dialectical unity of necessity and randomness shows that the universe is both lawful and creative: necessity provides stability, while chance introduces innovation and freedom.

Time and motion express the dynamic form of causality, transforming existence into an ongoing process of becoming. With the emergence of consciousness, causality attains self-reflection - the universe becomes aware of itself through the human mind. Thus, causality evolves from mechanical determination to moral and teleological awareness.

ISSN 1999-5911 (Print)
ISSN 2960-2173 (Online)

Understanding causality means recognizing humanity's responsibility within the cosmic order. Every action, thought, and intention contributes to the evolution of the whole. Therefore, causality is not only a principle of nature but also an ethical imperative - a bridge connecting knowledge and virtue, freedom and necessity, matter and spirit into one unified system of being.

List of references

1 Hegel, G. W. F. Science of Logic. Moscow: Mysl, 1970. – 415 p.

2 Spinoza, B. Ethics. Moscow: Nauka, 1989. – 312 p.

3 Kant, I. Critique of Pure Reason. Moscow: Eksmo, 2006. – 564 p.

4 Aristotle. Metaphysics. Moscow: Nauka, 1975. – 398 p.

5 Bogdanov, A. A. Tektology: The Universal Organizational Science. Moscow: Economics, 1980. – 328 p.

6 Einstein, A. Relativity: The Special and the General Theory. London: Routledge, 1960. – 168 p.

7 Heisenberg, W. Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science. New York: Harper, 1958. – 213 p.

8 Bergson, H. Creative Evolution. Moscow: Progress, 1998. – 320 p.

9 Whitehead, A. N. Process and Reality. New York: Macmillan, 1978. – 413 p.

10 Heidegger, M. Being and Time. Moscow: Ad Marginem, 1997. – 384 p.

11 Teilhard de Chardin, P. The Phenomenon of Man. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. – p.320

12 Wheeler, J. A. At Home in the Universe. New York: Springer, 1996. – 180 p.

13 Bohm, D. Wholeness and the Implicate Order. London: Routledge, 1980. – 200 p.

14 Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature. New York: Bantam Books, 1984. – 349 p.

15 Carter, B. Large Number Coincidences and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology. In: IAU Symposium 63: Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1974. – pp. 291–298.

16 Barrow, J. D., & Tipler, F. J. The Anthropic Cosmological Principle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986. – 706 p.

17 Popper, K. The Logic of Scientific Discovery. London: Hutchinson, 1959. – 480 p.

С.Б. Жуманиёзова

Ғаламдағы себеп-салдар байланыстарының философиялық аспектілері

Аңдатпа. Мақалада себептілік Әлемнің бірлігі мен дамуының іргелі қағидаты ретінде қарастырылады. Зерттеуде диалектикалық-жүйелік, герменевтикалық және синергетикалық әдіснамаларды біріктіретін пәнаралық тәсіл негізінде себептіліктің онтологиялық, эпистемологиялық және этикалық қырлары талданады. Ерекше назар себеп пен салдардың өзара байланысына, қажеттілік пен кездейсоқтықтың диалектикалық бірлігіне, сондай-ақ уақыт пен қозғалыстың себептік үдерістердің негізгі шарттары ретіндегі рөліне аударылады. Себептілік туралы түсініктердің классикалық философиядан бастап қазіргі ғылыми парадигмаларға дейінгі эволюциясы, оның ішінде салыстырмалылық теориясы, кванттық механика, жүйелік тәсіл және синергетика тұрғысынан қарастырылады. Мақалада себептілікті оқиғалардың сызықтық

детерминацияланған тізбегі ретінде емес, кері байланыстарға, эмерджентілікке және ықтималдық сипаттағы дамуға негізделген өздігінен ұйымдасатын әрі динамикалық өзара әрекеттесу жүйесі ретінде түсіну қажеттігі негізделеді. Сонымен қатар, антроптық принцип пен сананың шынайылық құрылымына мақсаттылықты, мағынаны және этикалық жауапкершілікті енгізетін себептіліктің жоғары формасы ретіндегі рөлі талданады. Зерттеу нәтижесінде себептілік табиғатты, сананы және мәдениетті өзара байланысқан әрі үнемі дамып отыратын ғарыштық тұтастық аясында біріктіретін әмбебап қағидат ретінде тұжырымдалады.

Түйін сөздер: себеп пен салдар, антроптық принцип, кездейсоқтық, кванттық механика, салыстырмалылық теориясы, кеңістік, уақыт.

С.Б. Жуманиёзова

Философские аспекты причинно-следственных связей во вселенной

Аннотация. В статье причинность рассматривается как фундаментальный принцип единства и развития Вселенной. Исследование раскрывает онтологические, эпистемологические и этические измерения причинности на основе междисциплинарного подхода, объединяющего диалектико-системную, герменевтическую и синергетическую методологии. Особое внимание уделяется взаимосвязи причины и следствия, диалектическому единству необходимости и случайности, а также роли времени и движения как ключевых условий причинных процессов. Анализируется эволюция представлений о причинности от классической философии до современных научных парадигм, включая теорию относительности, квантовую механику, системный подход и синергетику. Обосновывается положение о том, что причинность следует понимать не как линейную детерминированную последовательность событий, а как динамическую и самоорганизующуюся сеть взаимодействий, характеризующуюся обратными связями, эмерджентностью и вероятностным развитием. Особый акцент сделан на антропном принципе и роли сознания как высшей формы причинности, привносящей в структуру реальности целеполагание, смысл и этическую ответственность. Делается вывод, что причинность выступает универсальным принципом, объединяющим природу, сознание и культуру в рамках развивающегося и взаимосвязанного космоса.

Ключевые слова: причина и следствие, антропный принцип, случайность, квантовая механика, теория относительности, пространство, время.

Author Contributions. **S. Jumaniyozova** wrote the manuscript and prepared it for publication.

Received 23.03.2026
Accepted 14.05.2026