

NEW LAW OF LOGIC

Otajonov Gayrat Umarovich

Senior teacher of Kokand State Pedagogical Institute and Kokand University
Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

It is proved that the general laws of logical thinking – identity, non-contradiction, excluded-middle, rational inference cannot embrace all the aspects of the process of logical thinking and these aspects are reflected in the new law of logical thinking that is explained in this article.

The general laws of logical thinking – identity (Lat. *lex identitatis*), non-contradiction (Lat. *lex contradictionis*), excluded-middle (Lat. *lex exclusi terti sive medi interduo contradiktoria*), and rational inference (Lat. *lex rationis determinantis sive sufficientis*) reflect the most important associations of the elements of thought. To confirm them gives an opportunity to make our opinions correctly, clearly, and understandably for everyone, in define order, without any doubts and well grounded.

However, in our look, these laws cannot embrace some aspects of the process of logical thinking. **Firstly**, exactness is the demand of identity, but some devices of exactness are out of its sphere: especially, thought and language are not depend on it. Such as, “language is a resource of thought in addition; it has an influence itself. The mistakes in a language may be done by the mistakes of thought, at the same time the mistake of thought may be the results of the mistakes of language” [5]. **Secondly**, one of the basic demands of logical thinking is non-contradiction, but any of general laws of logical thinking is not full reflect the low of Non-Contradiction. **Thirdly**, the general laws of logical thinking – identity, non-con-tradiction, excluded-middle, rational inference put in order the aspects of the text which depend on each other, but none of them analysis the whole text. **Fourthly**, the law of identity indicates to express reality directly. Although, the mind of human uses also the possibility to express reality indirectly. On the basis of research give us the reason to summarize that a logical thought has new general law, and we called “**The law of Conformity**”. According to this law, **aim must be suitable with the expression in speech, and also during the expression each logical elements must complete previous one, the next one automatically should be needed**. The requirements of this law seem “too typical” as the law of identity. Nevertheless, we follow to the requirements of this law rarely. Let’s analysis this condition in examples. Firstly, the examples for **the aim should be suitable with the expression in speech**:

“*I’ll convey when I’m dead*” (from song), the main meaning is “I’ll convey even I’m dead”. “I will not cry if my tears full the rivers” (from music). We cannot say that it is a metaphor, an exaggeration or a comparison. Factually, the meaning is “I will not cry if my tears are such the rivers”. As we know, the tears do not full the rivers. If the tears express a full river, it is does not need to say, “I will not cry”. In some song the beauty of sweetheart is the aim, but they say the peculiarities that characterize as “Night butterflies”. “*At nights my sweetheart comes with saying words towards me, put her me, bro!*”

Now let’s look through the serious facts. The law of identity, non-contradiction, excluded-middle, rational inference, as we called “*the general laws of logical thinking*”, in some books they are called as, “*The basic laws of logical thinking*”. Here the expression of the language is not be suitable to the aim. Firstly, “logical thinking” is quite wide term; it does not only depend on logics. Secondly, we use “the basic law” on the basis of another laws. For instance, Constitution – basic of law. Other laws of logics do not base on counted laws, but only they are

needed on each process of thought. Just like that will be right call them “the general laws of logical thinking” instead of “the basic laws of logical thinking”. The next instance: “*Literature – art of words*”. This expression cannot open the meaning of literature widely.

The literature makes the imagery and that is why we call its art of words. Can the meaning will be the definition? So why we call “the art of note” instead of music, “the art of drawing” instead of painting? Giving this definition for literature does not correspond to the rule of description, because using words are neither exclusively essence nor only aim of literature. The meaning of these examples may be different, but the forms are the same – the expression in speech is not the same with its purpose. In some cases, we do these mistakes without understanding these rules. However, sometimes using this requirement fully – the equality with expressing in speech and its aim brings the violation in the law of identity and other logical laws. For instance, in sophistry uses different ways, methods to distract or deceive interlocutor. In this case may change terms or thesis, or even contexts and etc. The cause depends on the situation, but the situation is subjective. Now the second requirement of the law of Conformity – **the process of expressing each logical element must complete previous one, requires the next one.** Why in this requirement, initial point is the next logical element, not the previous one? Because the requirement of the law of Conformity is expression in speech must be suitable with its aim, contemplates an initial point and whole situation of each expression of speech.

The law of Conformity gives a great attention to this problem. Even, it can be found some mistakes in scientific works. There are some articles, which there is not any coherence between sentences: “*Beginning education has important juncture in our uninterrupted education. In nowadays general (overall) secondary schools plays important role as a leading level in uninterrupted education. So that teaching of each subject is getting significant day by day.*” Let’s analysis it, beginning education is the main subject in the first sentence, the secondary schools are in the second and subjects are in the third sentence; if you say more understandable: They are expressed the fruit from different trees. Here let’s pay attention to other features of the law of Conformity. The fact that it does not mean you have done all requirements of this law even your opinion corresponds to with previous and following sentences, fills each other and they are straightly express their purpose. Because, this law puts a requirement for each logical details. That means giving attention to the terms and connections of each opinion and reflection and their construction is very necessary.

Otherwise, it is difficult to understand the given opinion. For instance, “*The function of central spinal cord, medulla and midbrain’s motoneurons that ensure the movement of muscles is controlled by the central part in front of the cerebral hemispheres of nerve cells.*” It would be easier to catch its meaning if this text composed by the requirements of the law of Conformity: “*Motoneurons provide (ensure) the movement of muscles. The centers of motoneurons are placed in spinal cord, medulla and midbrain. The function of these centers is*

controlled by the nervous centers of movement which are nerve cells that situate in cerebral cortex of the brain on the outskirts of the central part of the previous bark”.

In a result the law of Conformity: **firstly**, connection of thought and language displays contemplation of logical features; **secondly**, serve for the clearness of opinion; **thirdly**, reflects full logical succession; **fourthly**, demonstrates logical principles to reflect reality indirectly; **fifthly**, describes logical technologies to create texts; **sixthly**, gives a chance to analysis the whole text logically; **seventhly**, during the process of learning serves as a methodological basis.

REFERENCES

1. Кондаков Н. Логический словарь-справочник (Logical-Reference Dictionary) second edition. М.Наука, 1975.
2. Савинов А.В. Логические законы мышление (The laws of logical thinking). Ленинград, 1958.
3. Свинцов В.И. Логика (Logic). Москва “Высшая школа”, 1987.
4. Фогараши Б. Логика (Logic). Москва, foreign literature publishing house, 1959.
5. Хаваш К. Так – логично (As logical). Москва, “Прогресс”, 1985.
6. Хайруллаев М, Ҳақбердиев М. Мантик (Logic). Тошкент, “Ўқитувчи”, 1993.
7. Чкнаверянц А.А. Закон тождества (The law of Identity). Москва, “Высшая школа”, 1961.
8. Sharipov M., Fayzixujayeva D. Мантик (Logic). Тошкент, F.Фуллом, 2004.
9. Ғайрат Умар “Мутаносиблик қонуни”. Тошкент, А.Навоий номидаги Ўзбекистон Миллий кутубхонаси нашриёти, 2016.