

## "Theories Of Truth And Lies: Philosophical And Psychological Aspects"

Kalankhojayeva Shafolat Khafizovna

Lecturer at the Department of "Pedagogy and Psychology," Kimyo international university in Tashkent (KIUT).

**Abstract:** The article presents definitions of lying, truth, veracity, deceit, and falsehood. It also examines theories of lying and truth, where scholars provide explanations of human communication based on lying and truth.

**Keywords:** lying, truth, veracity, interpretations

### INTRODUCTION.

In the process of socialization, a person learns to conceal their emotions, control them, and conform them to the internal social rules of the culture of emotions. V.I. Shakhovsky presents an interesting typology of the emotive side of lying, supporting it with examples from literature: lying as emotional stroking (compliments, flattery); lying as an emotional blow; lying as pretense to hide the truth; lying as marital infidelity; and lying as an internal state. Concealing true emotions is a kind of self-control, self-possession, and can thus be evaluated positively. However, the concealment of true emotions can also be viewed negatively. The external display of positive emotions while harboring a negative attitude towards the interlocutor is a vivid indication of dishonesty or a manifestation of duplicity and insincere communication.

Lying is a form of communication that involves two sides: the deceiver and the deceived. The deceiver intends to convey false impressions or information. However, the deceived must participate in the lie — at least on some level. This occurs either due to acquired apathy, ignorance, bias, or overconfidence (excluding mental impairment, of course). People are trusting for a variety of reasons, including a general tendency to

believe others are truthful, being cognitively overwhelmed, and then irrationally persuaded by emotional arguments and displays. Consequently, claims of crimes evoked by strong emotions are more likely to be believed (regardless of facts and evidence), given the prevalence of biased attitudes toward truth and the heuristic effect of influence, especially in the presence of other factors that generally increase overall gullibility.

Lying typically manifests as one of the following forms of dishonesty: outright deceit; half-truths; exaggerations; and corresponding omissions. Lies are told for one of two reasons: either the deceiver believes they will gain more from lying than from telling the truth, or the deceiver cannot recognize what constitutes the truth, whether temporarily or due to some permanent mental defect. Lies can be divided into two distinct motivational categories: prosocial lies, which are intended for the benefit of others, and antisocial lies, which are selfish. There is no method or piece of technology capable of reliably determining whether someone is lying. Scientific studies suggest that most people recognize lies with no greater accuracy than they would by chance (e.g., flipping a coin); and so-called “experts” in deception detection perform only marginally better. Pseudoscientific methods of lie detection persist because they are subjective and open to

interpretation. Subjective interpretations mean that analysts can shape the results to align with prevailing political trends or favor any desired outcome.

For the ancient Greeks, the word “truth” (alethia) literally translated as “not hidden,” denoting an event or a real fact that can be observed, identified, and described using words (Guseynov, 1996). This event or fact reveals itself or is discovered by people, and it may be subject to distortion or suppression. The concept of “truth” (dikaiosyne), in contrast to alethia, could not describe human qualities in ancient Greek and was attributed only to phenomena of the objective world. In ancient philosophy, truth was understood as the authenticity of being. For example, for Plato, truth was the world of eternal and immeasurable ideas, the genuine reality. Only the divine belonged to such genuine reality. Knowing the truth or even being partially involved in it was considered a benefit for a person (Burlachuk, 2002).

Aristotle viewed truth as the correspondence of statements to reality. He defined truth not as a property of things but rather as a property of thoughts. For him, truth was a meaning that corresponded to reality. While Plato and Aristotle related truth to reality to some extent, Gnostics and Neoplatonists began to perceive truth solely as something divine and eternal (Solovyov, 1896). According to this perspective, a person was considered truthful to the extent that they were close to the divine (Zhdanova, 1998). Moreover, in ancient philosophy, the question of the origin of truth was raised. The Stoics believed that truth existed independently and was given by nature. Plato believed that truth was created by people themselves. For Plato, a truthful person was someone who engaged in their own affairs and did not interfere in others’ affairs. Aristotle defined truth as the middle ground between injustice and justice. Truth was the middle, while falsehood was

the extreme (Znakov, 1993). Thus, ancient philosophers viewed truth concretely. We, however, will focus in more detail on relative and absolute truths. Some philosophers believe that the relativity of truth lies within the object of knowledge itself, meaning that the subject of knowledge is inexhaustible, mutable, and possesses numerous properties, making complete investigation of the object impossible. Consequently, truth is relative and only partially reflects reality (Spirkin, 2000).

### List of References:

- 1.Бурлачук Л. Ф. Психодиагностика. - СПб.: Питер, 2002.
- 2.Гусейнов Г. Ч. Ложь как состояние сознания // «Вопросы философии», 1989, №11.
- 3.Жданова О. О. Психологические особенности понимания лжи и обмана. // Вестник Российского гуманитарного научного фонда. - 1998., №4.
- 4.Знаков В.В. Неправда, ложь и обман как проблемы психологии понимания // Вопросы психологии. – 1993. – № 2. – С
- 5.Соловьёв В. С. Ложь // Энциклопедический словарь / Изд. Ф. А. Брокгауз, И. А. Ефрон. Т. ХVIIа. СПб., 1896.
- 6.Сpirkin А.Г. Философия: Учебник. М.: Гардарики, 2000. 816с.
- 7.Шаховский, В. И. Человек лгущий в реальной и художественной коммуникации // Человек в коммуникации : аспекты исследования. – Волгоград, 2005. – С. 173–204.