



Journal Website:
<https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ajsshr>

Copyright: Original
content from this work
may be used under the
terms of the creative
commons attributes
4.0 licence.

SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALOGY

Submission Date: February 13, 2024, Accepted Date: February 18, 2024,

Published Date: February 23, 2024

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajsshr/Volume04Issue02-14>

Mamatkulov Rashid Pazilbekovich

Associate Professor, Tashkent State University Of Law, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

As we know, there are deduction, induction, and analogy types of inference. Analogy (Greek - compatibility, similarity) means. In deductive inference, the thought is directed from the general to the singular, in induction, the thought is directed from the singular to the general, and in analogy, partial conclusions are drawn from partial thoughts.

KEYWORDS

The general, and in analogy, partial, partial thoughts.

INTRODUCTION

Analogy is a method of concluding, in which a conclusion is made about other signs from the similarity of several signs of two objects.

In the process of concluding analogy, events and events are compared and their differences and similarities are determined. In this process, rather than insignificant differences, attention is paid to the similarities of important signs. When concluding analogy, conclusions of a more probable nature are drawn.

There are two types of inference by analogy.

1. Analogy of characteristics (subjects).
2. Analogy of relations.

When concluding the analogy of properties (subjects), two single objects or two classes of objects in the same category are compared based on their similar aspects.

The scheme of this conclusion can be expressed as follows:

X subject, a b c has d characters.

Y subject too a b c has characters.

So, the Y subject too must have the symbol d.

For example, the Earth and the Sun are similar in some important features:

- they are heavenly bodies that are part of the same planets;
- both are constantly in motion;
- chemical elements with a similar chemical structure on Earth were also found in the Sun using spectral analysis.

Based on this similarity, scientists came to the conclusion that the new element (helium) found in the Sun must also be present on Earth.

In relational analogy, conclusions are made based on the signs of objects. For example, there are the following relations between two pairs of persons x and u, s and d.

- 1) x is the father, (in relation to R 1) he is a minor son father is considered
- 2) s - grandmother (R 2 in relation) d - the only closest of the minor grandchild is a relative.
- 3) the relationship between the father and the child, according to the established rules (R 1), the father is obliged to take care of his child and engage in his

education and upbringing. Taking into account the similar relationship between R 1 and R 2, it can be concluded that R2's grandmother is also a minor and has the authority to keep his grandson in his care and engage in education. The following formula can be used to conclude relative analogy.

Basics

1) to x R 1 y R 1 characteristic features PQST

2) m R 2 n R 2 characteristic symbols PQS

Conclusion: probably, R 2 has T character.

The level of concluding analogy, it is divided into the strict, non-strict, and false analogy. When concluding a strict analogy, we get a reliable and sufficient level of conclusion. When concluding a non-strict analogy, we get a probable conclusion.

When making a conclusion based on strict analogy, the objects, events, and signs of events are similar to each other. These signs determine the relationship between them. The following scheme represents such a situation:

Event A has symbols a, v, s, d, e.

has symbols a, v, s, d.

S is derived from the sum of characters a, v, s, d.

So, event V has sign e.

Arguments by analogy are not strict and false. It does not have such a clear structure. Therefore, the conclusions are probable or false. Argument by analogy is closely related to the types of deductive and inductive inference. Therefore, the inference by analogy is only inductive inference or only deductive. Inference is not in the form of inference.

Modeling has its place and importance in science. In this process, a model (likeness, example) of the studied object is developed. The model is a system of elements, in which certain aspects, relations, and functions of the object (or copy) applied in this system are recreated. The analogy is always with modeling. dependent. The pattern is created concerning the object that is being applied persistently. Modeling is done based on the similarity between the object to which a certain analogy is applied and its model. Moreover, there is always a difference between the model and the original, rather than exactness. A conclusion is drawn from the similarity between the model and the original. In this sense, modeling is close to analogy. The main task of modeling is the original and the model. The model is divided into two: mental and material. The mental model is divided into figurative, symbolic, and mixed types. The model analogy is a form of this symbolic model. For example, with Rutherford's rotation of the electron around the nucleus, the planets revolve around the sun and their axis. It is also a relational model. Here we see that creating a model

based on a certain analogy is the basis for discovering new theories. Creating a model based on similar aspects of subjects serves as a basis for creating a new theory. Such analogical models are used to analyze certain theories through experience. is important.

Concluding by analogy in most cases has a probable character. This probability manifests itself in different degrees. In some cases, the probability is close to the truth. In some cases, it can be a completely wrong conclusion.

The following conditions must be fulfilled to make a conclusion based on analogy.

1. The more common the signs of the compared criminal events and events, the more accurate the analogical conclusion will be. The possibility of making the correct conclusion will also increase.
2. If the signs of the compared criminal events and events consist of important signs for these events and events, the probability of a convincing conclusion increases and the conclusion is close to the truth.
3. The deeper the internal nature of the necessary relationships between the events of the compared criminal event, the higher the accuracy of the reliable conclusion. The characteristics of the compared criminal event and the events must be the same. When we compare it with the composition of another crime, the more we know their necessary connection

relations. If that crime reflects the essence of those events and events, and if there are no random signs in its composition, we can find out what criminal signs they have from their similarity.

4. If the sign of the compared criminal events and events is a specific sign of those events and events, then the level of correctness of the conclusion will be higher. If these signs also apply to other events and events and they do not have a special sign, then the probability of the correctness of the conclusion will be low.

In the process of knowledge, the important aspects of things and events are compared, and approximated, i.e., probable conclusions are drawn. These probable conclusions encourage an experimental experiment on that object, which, in turn, can serve as a basis for the discovery of important discoveries.

Concluding by analogy also has its place and importance in the system of legal sciences.

Representatives of the legal field apply to draw a conclusion by analogy in the following cases. In particular:

1. When giving a legal assessment of events and incidents.
2. In the process of criminal investigation.
3. In the process of conducting a criminal examination.

The rules of syllogism are applied when giving a legal assessment of a certain event and phenomenon. In this process, a certain legal norm serves as a major basis, and knowledge of concrete evidence serves as a minor basis. In this way, it is possible to conclude analogy in separate legal systems. Judges in the considered cases, legal relations may be encountered that are not provided for by the law. In this case, there is a need to draw a conclusion on analogy based on legal norms.

The logical structure of concluding by analogy in the case under consideration regarding a specific criminal act in the court process is represented by the following scheme:

Basics:

- 1) d 1 act provided by the law, symbols P, Q, M and S have legal consequences.
- 2) d 2 is an action not provided for by the law, has symbols P, Q, N.

CONCLUSION

In case of origin of the legal consequence, d 2 can be applied concerning d 1 . An analogy in inquiry. When analyzing the materials collected in connection with a specific criminal case, the judge and investigator work based not only on the knowledge and experience gained in science but also based on their skills and the experience of others. having information, he can

determine the signs and causes of the crime that were not known before with the determined grounds.

When solving a crime, making a conclusion based on analogy is important in determining how the crime was committed.

For example, citizen M. The investigator investigating the theft in his apartment found out that the theft was committed by a group of criminals when the owner left the room to go to the store. Later, during the investigation, it was found that the previous two thefts were committed in the same manner in an analogous situation. Therefore, based on analogy, it can be concluded that this criminal theft was committed by the members of the same criminal group.

Drawing a conclusion based on analogy is also widely used in criminalistic examination. In particular:

1. Identification of the person.

- based on external signs
- based on fingerprints
- based on feet, hands teeth, and other signs
- making an analogical conclusion based on text and signature.

2. Identifying the means used in the criminal process.

- the firearm used in the course of the crime identifies the weapon based on bullets and casings.

- based on the identification of traces of the vehicle used in the crime.

- making an analogical conclusion based on the weapons used in the course of the crime of theft.

In these cases, the criminologist makes an expert opinion in the process, knowledge about single objects passes to knowledge about similar objects. For example, a conclusion is made that fingerprints found at the crime scene belong to a specific person as a moving sign.

The degree of reasonableness of the expert criminologist's conclusion is related to the correct assessment of the similarities and differences of the compared object.

REFERENCES

1. Войшвилло Е. К. Понятие как форма мышления. - М., 1989.
2. Гетманова А.Д. Логика. - М., 1995.
3. Ивлев Ю. В. Логика. Учебник для вузов. - М.: Логос, 1998.
4. Кириллов В. И., Старченко А. А. Логика. -М.: "Логос", 1997.
5. Раҳимов И. Логиқадан амалий машғулотлар ва методик тавсиялар. - Т.: "Ўқитувчи", 1988.