



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.

"EVERYDAY THINKING" AND LOGICAL RATIONALITY

Submission Date: April 17, 2024, Accepted Date: April 22, 2024,

Published Date: April 27, 2024

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajsshr/Volume04Issue04-21>

Dilbar Fayzixodjaeva

Associate Professor at the National University of Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Knowing or not knowing, people find themselves in various unpleasant situations due to incorrect reasoning. Is it because they don't know logic and don't think logically? And those who know logic always think correctly and do not make mistakes? What is the relationship between correct reasoning and logical rationality? The purpose of the article is to determine the answers to these questions on the basis of psychologism in logic, non-monotonic logic, phenomenology of intersubjectivity.

KEYWORDS

Logic, rationality, intersubjectivity, psychologism, antipsychologism, argumentation.

INTRODUCTION

In everyday life, as a result of observing and analyzing the processes of interaction, we witness that even if a person knows the rules of the law established in society, he does not follow them. The simplest example. Many people have heard about the "golden mean", which has been recognized by philosophers for centuries and found its confirmation in life, that is, the rule that one should follow the standard in every field,

but even if they know, they do not follow it. Taking and giving bribes is a criminal act, and even though everyone is aware of it, people still take bribes and give bribes. Why is that? Any reasonable person should logically not allow such situations. But this and similar cases are many.

Elena Dragalina Chernaya explains this situation by the fact that the thinking of "people on the street" (lyudi s ulitsy) (those who have not studied logic) does not always conform to the laws of academic logic. He pointed out that when people think, they usually express their strong opinions based on past experiences, that is, they protect their personal beliefs, they do not want to put themselves in another person's place, they do not want to look at their thoughts from another person's point of view, they approach their own and other people's opinions with different criteria. that is, they show cognitive egocentrism. Analyzing the above situation, the author draws attention to the following dilemma: either to recognize street people as non-rational or to change traditional ideas about logic, reasoning and rationality [3.113.].

If we recognize that most people are irrational thinkers, then how do they live in society, adapt to life, and even thrive? What kind of thinking is irrational? Is it a thought that does not obey the laws of logic, or is it an idea that is incomprehensible to us? To answer the questions, it is necessary to revise the traditional view of the problem. A logical scientist bases his views on the analysis of the experiences of psychological scientists. After getting acquainted with the article of Dragalina Chernaya, we asked the question of how these thoughts are manifested in the process of interaction between people, and we chose virtual

communication, communication in social networks as the empirical basis of the research. Because almost all layers of the population communicate on social networks. In such communication, information is transmitted in the form of written or audio messages or emoticons. As a result, it becomes possible to analyze information.

METHOD

In our research, we relied on psychologism in logic, non-monotonic logic, phenomenology of intersubjectivity. Because logic is the science of acceptable ways of thinking, it is concerned with thinking. In our research, we started from the ideas of psychologism as a methodological direction in logic. Because in researching the process of argumentation, it is impossible to ignore and deny psychology, which directly studies the process of thinking [2.6-16.].

Here we explain what psychologism and antipsychology are. Psychologism and antipsychology are methodological approaches to logic and mathematics. According to the approach of psychologism, logic and mathematics are interpreted as specific models of thought, special "laws of thought" of logic and mathematics are recognized, and these laws are expressed in a certain objective form - speech acts, that is, reasoning. The anti-psychologist approach rejects the interpretation of logic and mathematics as specific models of thinking,

connecting the laws of thinking only with the matter of reasoning, not recognizing that these laws are immanently embedded in the process of living thinking. In this approach, the influence of factors such as a person's natural mental state, national characteristics, and social status on the process of thinking is denied. In reality, the influence of these factors is clearly visible. Analysis of situations related to real reality means that the mental state of an individual plays a decisive role in the process of cognition, knowledge is the result of the activity of a "living" subject [5].

The main part

Currently, research in the science of logic confirms the need to take into account achievements in psychology, in particular cognitive psychology [1.141.]. Some logicians claim that non-monotonic reasoning can be justified only from the point of view of psychologism. The main idea behind non-monotonous (unfounded, controversial, controversial) considerations is the idea of "habituality". People often rely on general, typical situations and forget or are not aware of their exceptional circumstances. For example, most people think that birds fly, but ignore that penguins and ostriches do not. Although there are exceptions, observations about typical cases are valuable in terms of knowledge. In general, all scientific theories are oriented to the study of ordinary phenomena, which change with the discovery of additional facts.

Nonmonotonic reasoning is also strongly linked to the role of additional information in trust and belief revision.

The population of the world is colorful according to racial, national, religious and other characteristics. Nevertheless, the population of the world is often divided into representatives of Eastern culture and Western culture. Communism and dialectical discourse are characteristic of Eastern culture representatives, while individuality and analytical discourse are characteristic of Western culture representatives. From the point of view of intercultural communication, their way of thinking, perception of reality and communication methods are different from each other. This situation is also manifested in the communication between individuals belonging to different cultures. A typical situation in the world of concepts of one representative of a culture may not exist in the world of concepts of another, that is, it may be unusual. If we take into account that each person has his own world of concepts, such "worlds" will be endless. These "worlds" may have common similarities (universal concepts), may be completely different from each other, or may have partial commonalities. In logic, this world is called "possible worlds" (vozmojnye miry - possible words).

The above considerations can be expressed in the language of non-monotonic logic as follows: W-possible worlds (representing the possible states of

the "universe"). Every assertion is true in some worlds and false in some worlds. For a statement to be normally true, it must be true in normal worlds. More precisely, if W is a large set, then X is a subset of it: $X \subseteq W$. A subset is a normal universe of an individual that is part of a larger set that combines the normal universes of other individuals. If we conclude from some basis, then we start from an even smaller set: $N(X) \subseteq X$. Based on this idea, the relation "nonmonotone follow" ($\sim$) can be symbolically expressed according to the rule $A \sim V$ as follows: $N(A) \subseteq B$. The symbol N in the formula represents choice (mental choice). So, according to the above formula ($N(X) \subseteq X$), each person makes a choice based on his possible universe.

An example of such a choice is the open letter of Sophie Petronen, a French citizen, who returned to her homeland and converted to Islam after being released from captivity in Mali[7.]. If we denote the world of concepts, worldview of Maryam Sofi Petronin by X , the world of concepts and thinking specific to people in general, we see the relationship between $X \subseteq W$. His conversion to Islam represents his worldview choice $N(X)$, and this choice is $N(X) \subseteq X$, the result of changes in his world of concepts. Maryam Sofi Petronin's letter provides information about both rational (position of Mali women in society, attitude towards them, etc.) and emotional (listening to recitation of the Qur'an, observing prayer, etc.) reasons for selection. It can be said that even though his choice was considered

irrational, i.e. illogical, by most Europeans, this choice can be seen to have its own rationale. In the phenomenology of intersubjectivity of Ya.A.Slinin, it is recognized that freedom of choice is unique to every person.

The population of the world is colorful according to racial, national, religious and other characteristics. Nevertheless, the population of the world is often divided into representatives of Eastern culture and Western culture. Communism and dialectical discourse are characteristic of Eastern culture representatives, while individuality and analytical discourse are characteristic of Western culture representatives. From the point of view of intercultural communication, their way of thinking, perception of reality and communication methods are different from each other. This situation is also manifested in the communication between individuals belonging to different cultures. A typical situation in the world of concepts of one representative of a culture may not exist in the world of concepts of another, that is, it may be unusual. If we take into account that each person has his own world of concepts, such "worlds" will be endless. These "worlds" may have common similarities (universal concepts), may be completely different from each other, or may have partial commonalities. In logic, this world is called "possible worlds" (vozmojnye miry - possible words).

The above considerations can be expressed in the language of non-monotonic logic as follows: W-possible worlds (representing the possible states of the "universe"). Every assertion is true in some worlds and false in some worlds. For a statement to be normally true, it must be true in normal worlds. More precisely, if W is a large set, then X is a subset of it: $X \subseteq W$. A subset is a normal universe of an individual that is part of a larger set that combines the normal universes of other individuals. If we conclude from some basis, then we start from an even smaller set: $N(X) \subseteq X$. Based on this idea, the relation "nonmonotone follow" ($\sim$) can be symbolically expressed according to the rule $A \sim V$ as follows: $N(A) \subseteq B$. The symbol N in the formula represents choice (mental choice).

An example of such a choice is the open letter of Sophie Petronen, a French citizen, who returned to her homeland and converted to Islam after being released from captivity in Mali [7.]. If we denote the world of concepts, worldview of Maryam Sofi Petronin by X, the world of concepts and thinking specific to people in general, we see the relationship between $X \subseteq W$. His conversion to Islam represents his worldview choice $N(X)$, and this choice is $N(X) \subseteq X$, the result of changes in his world of concepts. Maryam Sofi Petronin's letter provides information about both rational (position of Mali women in society, attitude towards them, etc.) and emotional (listening to recitation of the Qur'an, observing prayer, etc.) reasons for selection. It can be

said that even though his choice was considered irrational, i.e. illogical, by most Europeans, this choice can be seen to have its own rationale. In the phenomenology of intersubjectivity of Ya.A.Slinin, it is recognized that freedom of choice is unique to every person.

According to Ya.A. Slinin's phenomenology of intersubjectivity, society is an intersubjective world [4.5.]. The intersubjective world is to some extent a part of human intentional (lat. intentio —aspiration, intention, goal) objects. The existence of common intentional objects is the basis for people to coordinate their behavior with others (to work together), to exchange information through speech. They understand each other because speech communication creates a common picture of the intersubjective world in which a person exists. In mutual communication, they exchange information not only about the external world, but also about their inner world (feelings). In the intersubjective universe there is no object without a subject [4.67.]. Objects that are not connected with a person's aspirations and goals do not exist in his intersubjective world.

Desire evaluates whether desires are right (reasonable) or not. An intentional object forms a desirable, undesirable, or indifferent attitude. Emotions, reason and desire give impetus (motive) to human behavior. As a result, a person has to choose one of the mutually exclusive motives of action.

Freedom of choice is exercised either according to feelings or according to reason. These may overlap or partially overlap, which in turn affects communication between people in the intersubjective world.

Objects in the intersubjective world exist either necessarily (apodictically) or probabilistically (problematically). Objects that man has not doubted exist and now exist are necessary objects in the intersubjective world. The subjective primordial (lat. Primordialis - beginning) world of a person is opposite to the intersubjective world. Objects whose existence is doubted, past or future, are probable. According to the phenomenological method, various aspirations and goals motivate a person to perform certain actions. Communication of a person through speech acts occurs before action.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, argumentation means persuasion, not coercion. In the logical communicative theory of argumentation, persuasion is based on a choice of reason and/or interest. We cannot absolutize the laws of formal logic and accuse some people of irrational thinking. Their rationality is manifested under the influence of intentions in the intersubjective world, in which non-monotonic logical factors are involved. That is why "non-rational thinkers" live in society, communicate with others and can justify their thoughts and actions. Only their conclusions are based

on their daily life experiences. Argumentation as a communicative process represents the understanding and acceptance of the defended point of view and the entry into the spiritual world of the individual. It is necessary not only to understand argumentation as a purely logical process, but also to study its features such as perception, understanding and acceptance of the point of view inherent in it, formation of confidence in its truth and acceptability. This is especially important for understanding argumentation as a real, live communicative activity. In each concrete case, there is an appropriate context determined by the socio-cultural, values and outlook of the thinking subject, and he forms a "context of justification" accordingly. Paying attention to the addressee, the audience, opening the mechanisms of psychological and emotional influence on him in order to accept the defended point of view are the dominant components of modern, foreign research on argumentation [6.51]. Because it is not always enough for the point of view to be accepted, it is important and necessary to ensure the effectiveness of the communicative process, how it is "presented", i.e. choosing the psychological, axiological, ethical aspects of the arguments, taking into account the audience. Truth-telling and reasoning are certainly important for communication, but even more so are feelings of kindness, pity, and respect.

REFERENCES

1. Gabbay D., Woods J. The New Logic // Logic Journal of IGPL. 2001. Vol. 9(2). P. 141.
2. Бажанов В.А. Дилемма психологизма и антипсихологизма./ Эпистемология и философия науки 2016. Т. 49. № 3. С. 6–16
3. Драгалина Черная Е.Г. Неформальнѣ заметки о логической форме. СПб.: Алетейя, 2015. С. 113.
4. Слинин Я.А. Феноменология intersubjectivity. Санкт Петербург: Наука., 2004. С.67.
5. Сорокина Г.В. Проект «психологизм – антипсихологизм» в метатеоретическом контексте // Рацио.ru. 2012. № 8. С. 20–45.
6. Яскевич Я.С. Методология и этика в современной науке: поиск открытой рациональности. Минск, БГЭУ. 2007.с.51.
7. Француженка после плена приняла Ислам [https://www.instagram.com > m.barkii > Post](https://www.instagram.com/m.barkii) (5.04.2024 да кўрилди)

OSCAR
PUBLISHING SERVICES