

Problem of Explanation and Understanding in the Evaluation Logic

¹Saydazimov T. Kamol

Abstract--*Nowadays, the theory of speech acts is of great interest to philosophy and linguistics as an illustrative expression of the use of language. The process of studying the environment, social, political and economic events is not a problem. And the process of understanding and explanation in human life is a huge responsibility. We will try to look at the following questions in our article: What is the logic of assessment? How does understanding and clarification work in evaluation logic? In this article, the author talks about the descriptive expression of language consumption in the theory of speech acts today. The functions of the speech process performed by the language and the role of using the language in the evaluation logic are indicated. The article also discusses the nature of the logic of evaluation, the nature of the concepts of understanding and explanation, as well as the role of evaluation in human understanding and interpretation.*

Keywords--*the character of the differences between language consumption, the functions of the speech process, linguistic and cognitive unity, as well as descriptive and evaluative functions.*

I. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that over the years, language has only an expressive function of expression. It has been suggested that any correct statement may be described as true or false. There are also non-visual tasks for the language. In the 1920s, linguistic semiotics such as Charles Kay Ogden and Ivor Armstrong Richards focused on expressions and showed that the emotional expression of a language is sometimes incompatible with its expressive meaning. It is worth noting that the five functions of this language are enough for reasoning and application. Firstly, according to Wittgenstein, the language means are different and cannot be compared with a specific “legal list”. Secondly, the real-time message is not always the same. Thirdly, there are other independent functions that are not typical for using the language in the theory of the speech process. This applies to assessments and perspectives, which are positive judgments that stimulate the will of the listener, which stimulate the emotions of the listener. Logical, everyday, grammatical forms of language come in the form of descriptive expressions, not evaluators. Therefore, it should be borne in mind that in the comments on the ethical principles or laws of science, there are double descriptive and evaluative judgments, both in the texts and sometimes as evaluators.

In logic, philosophy and rhetoric, it is important to take into account the differences between the two functions of the language, namely, expressive and evaluative functions. The main task of comparing thought and reality is to express “true” and “false” concepts that arise in terms of reasoning in the form of reality in reality. In the second task, the reasoning appears as a standard, a plan, and the situation represented by the concepts of “good”, “bad” and “in consequential” is compared with reality. The purpose of figurative expression is to compare the word

¹Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, Tashkent Pediatric Medical Institute, Uzbekistan

with the world, and the task of evaluation is the opposite. The functions of such a contradictory language cannot be compared. None of them are mutually fundamental or primary.

Review of the literature on the topic

The theory advanced by English philosophers L. Wittgenstein and J. Austin in the development of speech act theory has been extensively studied in recent decades. These ideas have been developed and elaborated by J. Searle, P. Strawson and others [1]. Linguistic semiotics such as Charles Key Ogden and Ayvor Armstrong Richards in the twentieth century have focused their attention on expressions and have shown that the emotional expression of language is sometimes inconsistent with its expressive meaning [2].

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In the course of the research, the following general and philosophical methods were used: historical, objectivity, abstraction, concrete, systematic analysis, comparative analysis.

III. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

These processes are interconnected and contradictory. Because he argues that neopositivism is not only one of the main tasks, but philosophical hermeneutics limits the process of explanation in the natural sciences and claims that it does not go beyond the humanities. The logic of evaluation is a section that examines the logic of evaluative reasoning and logical connections in the science of logic. Then the following is important: 1) at the same time, nothing good happens at all; insignificant and not bad; (2) If something is insignificant, the opposite is also trivial; 3) The first is evaluated, and the second can be good if the first and second are good. Value judgments are widely used in everyday life, as well as in the social and philosophical sciences [3].

Understanding can come in the form of understanding and interpretation of the meaning of human activity. Understanding is connected with the entry into the “world of meanings” of another person, understanding and interpretation of his thoughts and thoughts. Understanding is the search for meaning, because only that which makes sense can be understood.

To date, the process of explanation and understanding has become the most important tool of the humanities, natural sciences, systematization and methodological functions of cognition in natural science. The concept is closely related to the axiological elements that illuminate the concept of evaluation.

The process of explanation is a process in which truth is generalized and shared values are shared. Understanding seeks to eliminate significant and necessary events from the general need for evaluation. This is because clarity, like any description, is an event, and an assessment of the understanding process is a matter of necessity.

In addition to understanding, there is an explanation as well as an important cognitive procedure. Its main goal is to identify the nature of the subject being studied, the reasons for its development and mechanisms of action. Therefore, the narrative can be understood as a generalization of a specific fact or event [5].

The German philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey describes the relationship between understanding and values: “Understanding and appreciation. There is a possibility that there is an underrated understanding, and the process of evaluation and understanding cannot be divided. This is the only, impartial movement that exists simultaneously”[6].

Indeed, the narrator determines his approach to a specific work on the basis of his independent worldview and position. This situation not only describes the assessment, but also updates the work. Only inertia, in a dogmatic position, does not extend to novelty in work. Because a dogmatist cannot be enriched without departing from what he already has.

The process of understanding, which reflects a single, impartial effort, is enriched by mutual change, originality and innovation. The “positions” and “positions” referred to here do not necessarily reflect the assessment, but rather are unstable in this context.

It is worth noting that the concept of “understanding” is multifaceted and can be described as rational or intuitive. When rational understanding reflects the conclusion that a particular judgment is the result of an emotional, emotional understanding of forms of intuitive or "irrational" understanding. Empathy is a state of consciousness that can be experienced with the emotional state of the current emotional state of another person without losing your sense of external origin. All forms of understanding show value, but it is important to recognize that any understanding is not the result of reasoning.

Understanding requires that a phenomenon be considered a value other than an explanation, and that the assessment of a particular event arises from an assessment based on existing standards.

Understanding logic can be divided into:

- Understanding, which is based on a general assessment;
- Targeted understanding that is not based on random judgment and general judgment; [7]
- The first type of understanding is deductive conclusions.
- For instance; The patient should follow the advice of a doctor.
- N. - patient
- In conclusion, he must follow the doctor’s advice.
- A common form of understanding:
- Everything should be A, B.
- Any C is A
- So any C, B should be.

This is a form of deductive conclusions based on value judgments, and the second is a confirmation of the initial conditions. From this point of view, the concept of “good” can be expressed by the concept of “must have”. It should be noted that in everyday language assessments (such as “good”, “bad”, “indifferent” and “better”, “worse”, “equally”) are used instead of “should”.

Common form of weakness:

- Reason A.
- B is positively important.
- So A is probably a positive thing.
- To illustrate this with a simple example:
- If the passenger does not run faster, he or she will not get to the bus.
- The passenger must board the bus.
- This means that the passenger must run as fast as possible.
- The second type can be considered weak.
- The explanation will have a process of reasoning and a description of the event to be explained.

There are two types of interpretation: the first is an explanation of the phenomenon described in a specific general situation, the second is an explanation method based on random reasoning, and not on general unverifiable reasoning. Most explanatory processes present explanation through general approval. In the second phenomenon explained, the statement is interpreted as a law of science, and not as a coincidence. The explanatory processes that occur through the laws of science are defined as nominological or explanatory explanations. This scientific idea began to appear in the mid-19th century. Interest in this process A. Paunkare, Dj. Observed in the studies of Mill, D. Duke.

Understanding means understanding the meaning of a particular event, its place in the world, and its functions as a whole. In order for the process of understanding to take place, the following is necessary: an object expressed in any text; the presence of meaning in it; initial idea of this meaning; interpretation of the text, that is, an understanding of the meaning of the text; the translator's self-esteem, communication, communication; "Language element" ability to communicate: desire to express one's opinion; to connect the content of the text with the cultural thinking of our time; [8]

Cognition is the process of perceiving the world by the human mind. A person cannot engage in any activity without knowledge and understanding of the environment. The result of knowledge is knowledge, and the acquisition of any profession occurs only through knowledge. Knowledge is only a spiritual need, a vital necessity inherent in people [9].

Knowledge is an endless process, from knowledge to ignorance, perfecting incomplete knowledge and integrating incomplete and incomplete knowledge. In this process, the problem of truth is manifested in its absolute and relative form. Truth is a person's full knowledge of the objective world, which cannot be denied in the future [10].

In many aspects of the cognitive process, we are faced with relative truths. At the same time, we must consider the relationship and the logical structure of deontic logic, that is, normative reasoning. Deontic sentences (deontic sentences) mean normative reasoning.

The scope of these rules is wide, and they are presented in the form of rules, laws, technical standards, habits and ethical principles. Norms are a particular form of assessment [11].

Norms come in the form of conditionality or prohibition in everyday language with such imperative considerations as “conditional”, “positive” or “forbidden”. These terms: “conditional”, “acceptable” or “prohibited” coincide with general actions, which in turn form regulatory provisions.

Managing human behavior is one of the most important tasks of the norm, so that future actions can be controlled; and correlation with the future determines that the norm is a regulatory function [12].

Indeed, norms are used to evaluate and interpret past actions. We will also try to review the process of action management; A practical question, such as “What should I do?”, Covers the regulatory function of norms or the reaction of the structures of deontological discourse. Accordingly, through the structure of deontological discourse, the agent will have to make a decision about the specific situation of the action in certain future situations. This is because deonton is often used as a guideline for solving a specific problem. The situation in this case is described as “practical”, and the agent’s decision is “practical”.

A practical solution should include at least two alternative actions. Because without alternatives there will be no choice or opportunity to make a decision.

To answer a practical question, an inappropriate sentence should be normative or practical, and not just descriptive. Because it is clear that any information corresponds to information related to a specific norm or system of norms. In turn, it is likely that this action will be contrary to other standards. Interestingly, these two facts can come in the form of certainty. It is worth noting that such information sometimes does not provide a practical solution. Because the agent is not really telling you what to do. In this case, when deciding on the truth, not only deonton discourse is necessary, but it is also important.

Indeed, from the point of view of the definition of truth: truth is an opinion, a thought that is consistent with its subject. In the science of logic, the question of truth is important in the following aspects:

After all, the basis for evaluating our thoughts as true and false may not necessarily be material reality; Ideas about idealized objects or artistic texture also make sense.

It deals with the conditions for determining whether logic is true or not. It is these conditions that help determine the logical conclusions and logical concepts that are fundamental to the science of logic [13].

A practical solution based on genuine deontism is a rational and close to reality situation. Naturally, the question arises: do practical, deontonistic statements have exact terms of truth? Well, if so, in which cases are they true?

The answers to these questions vary depending on the philosophical position they are considering. In general terms, we can distinguish between two practical philosophies (ethics, axiology, philosophy of law) that correspond to two approaches: realism and conceptualism.

From the point of view of realism, the fact that some facts that are part of reality may be the reason that the rules will be true. In such realities, norms are true or false. In turn, the established facts are normative or evaluative. In this sense, values are objective, which means that they are part of existence and are not connected by human

behavior and interests. It is well known that people are interested in a certain thing because it has value. Since only people have reasons to approve, desire and be interested in this particular thing, some things seem valuable to them.

From the point of view of conceptualism, values do not exist in reality, but are a product of human activity, which is formed by people. Due to the lack of normative and estimated data and not related to reality, the norms do not have a realistic and reliable expression. We can tell the truth only in terms of organized values. Consequently, deontic statements are true or false in a particular value system, and their authenticity corresponds to these systems. This concerns misunderstandings of normative knowledge and deontic reality. The purpose of the article is also to identify factors that distinguish between these concepts.

We strive to draw attention to the research of the seekers of deontic logic and their semantic interpretations. They focus on the authenticity of deontic logic. It is worth noting that the essence of the differences between realism and conceptualism is poorly understood in their research. Deontological logic: the need to expand the concept of reality in the definition of deontic reality; it's not enough just to turn to reality, but to point out the need to pay attention to the current reality, comparing it with reality.

What is deontic logic? Deontic logic is logic that explores the logical structure of a normative language; doctrine of normative concepts. Deontic logic explores expressions, norms in the form of a command. When modeling norms using logical theory, the relationship between norms and elements is of paramount importance.

The structural elements of the norms are:

- 1) The nature of the standards - ensures compliance, permits or prohibits;
- 2) the content of the rules - necessarily, possibly prohibited;
- 3) conditions for the application of standards;
- 4) an agent or subject of norms [14].

Indeed, deontic logic is a branch of logic that explains the logic of norms and explores the relationships and the logical structure of normative thinking (from the Greek language deon duty and logic; normative logic).

The distinction between realism and conceptualism is realistic, and in practice only theoretical and random answers. That is, it takes into account that this directly affects our attitude to the outside world and our values.

Another important aspect is that our language is also realistic. However, these facts do not indicate that realism is a philosophical theory. Since conceptualism considers this issue from a philosophical point of view, realism itself seeks to theoretically substantiate itself. Such barriers of philosophical disagreement are difficult to overcome either by empirical observation or by linguistic or conceptual analysis. Because such methods require a certain metaphysical approach.

When we look at the terms of truth in discourses on truth, we focus on dividing what is necessary, prohibitive, or permissible in certain cases into true or false. In practical deontic discourse, the signs of truth can be divided into three main groups, which depend on the following factors:

Real-time agent.

We need a realistic description of the agent, which reflects the completeness of the future decision-making process. This description reflects real and current facts from the past and present. Examples of “natural” facts or events are the actions taken by the agent, his wishes, as well as the actions and programs of another agent. Of course, not all of these facts may be relevant, and for this the factual facts of the particular time in question must be provided with a complete list of descriptive facts.

Future facts and alternative facts.

Of course, we must take into account the consequences of future opportunities, namely the effects that the agent can produce, and the possible openness of all possible alternatives in any situation [15]. The interconnectedness of these future situations and actions does not depend on a generally accepted conceptual approach to ethics. Conservatism is a group of moral theories, and the result (assignment) of behavior is a criterion for moral evaluation. Here, however, there may be a problem.

The problem is a situation that represents the objective need to change existing knowledge about the world and its knowledge, methods and means of knowing at different stages and stages of cognitive development. The problem arises as a result of the inconsistency between the existing scientific representations and the new facts, or the fact that these scientific representations are not systematized, and do not support them as a holistic doctrine [16]

The order of hierarchical historical processes.

In determining the agent process in each situation, it is necessary to provide a hierarchical organization of each historical process. This allows each historical event to determine its relative value. As a rule, a certain social situation, condition is compared with each historical process. There are two types of hierarchy of historical processes: optimal summation and deviation of aggregates. An acceptable set contains one or more historical processes and excludes others. This separation is compared with the initial situation or condition: a historical process that is excluded in one case may be optimal in another. This fact makes the relativity of truth in the context of the situation contradictory. Thus, deontic classification of necessary, forbidden or permissible movements is performed using a hierarchy.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

To summarize, refinement and understanding are two one-dimensional thinking operations that complement each other. The difference in the process of understanding and explanation is not in their structure, but in their nature and content. Explanatory processes are reflected in true or false judgments. At the same time, the parallel connection between understanding and interpretation is incomplete, since causality is reflected in the deductive discussion in the narrative process. It is clear that this is not happening. In this article we have analyzed only some of the issues related to normative knowledge, reasoning about the truth. Many issues related to this issue have not yet been resolved.

REFERENCES

1. Austin John. Favorites. Translation from English Makeeva L.B., Rudneva V.P.-M. Idea press. 1999.16 p.
2. Ivin A.A. Logic. M. 1998. 51 p.
3. Fayzihodjaeva D. Logic. Explanation. “Civilization” Tashkent. 2015. 35 p.

4. Abhay Raman, Ankit Kr. Singh, Abhishek Rai Institute of Technology and Management. "MINIMIZING DELAY AND MAXIMIZING LIFETIME FOR WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORKS WITH ANYCAST." International Journal of Communication and Computer Technologies 1 (2013), 96-99. doi:10.31838/ijccts/01.02.06
5. Shermuhamedova N. Philosophy and Methodology of Science. Tashkent 2008. 312 p.
6. Shermuhamedova N. Philosophy and Methodology of Science. Tashkent 2008. 316 p.
7. Rubendra Kurmi, Dinesh Kumar Mishra, Dinesh Kumar Jain (2016) Solid Dispersion: A Novel Means Of Solubility Enhancement. Journal of Critical Reviews, 3 (1), 1-8.
8. Wilhelm Diltey. Hermeneutics istoriya literatury. Sobranie hairineniy, vol 4. 2001. M.: Dom intellectual intellectual knight. 331 p.
9. Ivin A.A. Logic Occurrences and Norms M.2016. 223 p.
10. Kumar A. "Past, Present and Future of Pharmacovigilance in India." Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy 2.1 (2011), 55-58. Print. doi:10.4103/0975-8453.83440
11. Shermuhamedova N. Philosophy and Methodology of Science. Tashkent 2008. 316 p.
12. Philosophy Encyclopedic Dictionary. Publishing House of the National Society of Philosophers of Uzbekistan "Sharq". Tashkent - 2004. 55 p.
13. Philosophy Encyclopedic Dictionary. Publishing House of the National Society of Philosophers of Uzbekistan "Sharq". Tashkent - 2004. 289 p.
14. Fayzihodjaeva D. Logical Explanatory Dictionary. "Civilization" Tashkent. 2015. 151 p.
15. Thomason R.H. Deontic Logic as Founded on Tens Logic // New Studies in Deontic Logic / ed. R. Hilpinen. Dordrecht; Boston; London, 1981. P. 165-176.
16. Fayzihodjaeva D. Logical Explanatory Dictionary. "Civilization" Tashkent. 2015. 259 p.
17. Fayzihodjaeva D. Logical Explanatory Dictionary. "Civilization" Tashkent. 2015. 53 p.
18. Mackie J.L. Ethics. London, 1977. 35 p.
19. Fayzihodjaeva D. Logical Explanatory Dictionary. "Civilization" Tashkent. 2015. 132 p.
20. Mizuno, J., & Takahashi, S. (2014). Electrical Chock Dangerous for Human in Flooding Situation. *The SIJ Transactions on Computer Science Engineering & its Applications*, 2(4), 82-85.
21. Jayapratha, S., & Dr.Pabitha, P. (2018). Topic Categorization based on User behaviour in Random Social Networks Using Firefly Algorithm. *Bonfring International Journal of Software Engineering and Soft Computing*, 8(2), 11-15.
22. Das, T. Origin and storage of consciousness (2015) *NeuroQuantology*, 13 (1), pp. 108-110.
23. Meijer, D.K.F. The universe as a cyclic organized information system: John wheeler's world revisited (2015) *NeuroQuantology*, 13 (1), pp. 57-78.